University Return.

DR. RYERSON'S REPLY

TO THE

RECENT PAMPHLET OF MR. LANGTON & DR. WILSON,

ON THE

UNIVERSITY QUESTION.

IN

Five Letters to the Hon. M. Cameron, M.L.C.

CHAIRMAN OF THE LATE

University Committee of the Legislative Assembly.

"A writer who builds his arguments on facts, is not easily to be confuted. He is not to be answered by general assertions and general reproaches. He may want eloquence to amuse or persuade; but speaking the truth, he must always convince."—*Letters of Junius.*

Toronto:

PRINTED AT THE "GUARDIAN" OFFICE, KING STREET EAST, TORONTO.

1861.

DR. RYERSON'S REPLY

TO THE

RECENT PAMPHLET OF MR. LANGTON & DR. WILSON,

ON THE

UNIVERSITY QUESTION,

IN

Five Letters to the Hon. M. Cameron, M.L.C.

CHAIRMAN OF THE LATE

University Committee of the Legislative Assembly.

"A writer who builds his arguments on facts, is not easily to be confuted. He is not to be answered by general assertions and general reproaches. He may want eloquence to amuse or persuade; but speaking the truth, he must always convince."—*Letters of Junius.*

Toronto:

PRINTED AT THE "GUARDIAN" OFFICE, KING STREET EAST, TORONTO.

1861.

Dr.

(*Pet*

Si
advo
Ques
semb
in C
versi
othe
whic
objec
in
inste
by
strat
inves
doub
not.

T
porti
of th
the
had
and
Colle
dent
the
natio
mind
be th
tact

UNIVERSITY QUESTION.

Dr. Ryerson's Reply to a Recent Pamphlet of Mr. Langton and Dr. Wilson.

TO THE HON. M. CAMERON, M. L. C.,

&c., &c., &c.

LETTER I.

(Petitions and Parliamentary Investigations on the University Question.)

Sir,—To you, as an old friend of Victoria College, and an avowed advocate of the views of the Wesleyan Body on the University Question, was confided last year for presentation to the Legislative Assembly the memorial of the Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada in behalf of Victoria College, and in favour of a national University on a national basis. On your motion, that Memorial, with various others on the same subject, was referred to a Select Committee, of which you were Chairman. That Memorial alleged, that the national objects of the University Act of 1853 had been departed from in the nature and prodigality of expenditures, and in lowering instead of keeping up the standard of University education as prescribed by the Statute. That these allegations were proved to a demonstration, I believe neither you nor any other persons who witnessed the investigation, or have read the Minutes of it, have ever for a moment doubted, whether they agreed in the theory or prayer of the Petitioners or not.

(Effect of the Investigation at Quebec.)

The Committee, by the close of the Session, ceased to exist without reporting; but the convictions produced by the investigation in the minds of the members of the Legislature were amply attested by the fact, that the Parliamentary grants to the two Colleges of the Petitioners, which had never before passed the Legislative Assembly without some debates and divisions, were not only continued, but increased £500 to each College, and passed without division or objection—a proceeding unprecedented of its kind in Canada, and illustrative of the irresistible power of the truth, justice and patriotism involved in the Christian principles and national views of the Petitioners when brought into contact with the minds of intelligent men of all parties. And the effect has been and will be the same wherever the same principles and views are brought into contact with enlightened Christian minds.

(Dr. Ryerson's Position and Proposal at Quebec.)

You will recollect that I appeared before the Committee in no official capacity, but as an individual witness in obedience to your summons; that I was subsequently thrust into an unusual prominence by the the attempts made to break down my evidence. You know I gave Mr. Langton and Dr. Wilson the advantage of the last word, without rejoinder, though it was my right.

You will also recollect that, at the close of the investigation, I said, so far as I was concerned, I was for peace, and willing to let the Legislature and country judge and decide by the publication of what had been recorded in the minutes of the Committee on both sides; but that if my assailants were still resolved on war, they should have it to their heart's content.

(Each party left to publish its own Evidence.—University propagandism. —Mr. Langton and Dr. Wilson renew the late contest with Dr. Ryerson.)

Only about 50 copies of the Minutes of Evidence before the Committee having been printed for the use of members and witnesses, it remained for each party to publish and circulate its own evidence at its own discretion and in its own way. I had my defence of the Petitioners, in reply to Mr. Langton and Dr. Wilson, printed without note or comment, just as it was recorded in the minutes of the Committee, without the alteration or addition of a sentence. Mr. Langton did the same in regard to his speech. Dr. Wilson, not being satisfied with what he had laid before committee in writing, and which was recorded in its minutes, wrote out, a month after delivery, a pseudo version of it under the *nom de plume* of a Mr. A. K. Edwards. A system of Toronto College propagandism was set on foot, and openly proclaimed at a public University dinner at Toronto, the Chancellor enjoining each of the faithful to execute his mission on the house tops and in the streets throughout the land. This challenge was answered by the speeches and proceedings of the Wesleyan Conference, held in Kingston in June, and various public meetings. Mr. Langton and Dr. Wilson have lately renewed the contest with me by publishing a closely printed pamphlet, (with copious notes) of 90 pages, and entitled "University Question. The statements of John Langton, Esq., M. A., Vice-Chancellor of the University of Toronto, and Professor Daniel Wilson, LL.D., of University College, Toronto; with notes and extracts from the evidence taken before the Committee of Legislative Assembly on the University."

In reply to that pamphlet, or rather to the notes of it, I now desire to address you. The speeches, or text, of the pamphlet are those to which my Defence of the Petitioners was a reply; and I should deem it superfluous to add a word to that Defence, were it not for the numerous notes in which Mr. Langton and Dr. Wilson have spared no pains to impugn me and misinterpret the facts of the question. At this busy season I will answer them as briefly as possible—first correcting the misstatements of each, and then stating and establishing the general facts and principles of the question,—the question of questions for the progress and welfare of Canada.

(Mr. Langton and Dr. Wilson publish a combined edition of their pamphlet at the expense of the University Funds.)

Before entering into particulars, I beg to make three general remarks:—The one is, that this pamphlet, (if not the preceding ones also,) has been published at the expense, not of its authors, not of the College whose monopoly it advocates,—but at the expense of the Funds of the University, of which the parties whom they assail are as much members as themselves,—a fact which I should not have known had not Mr. Langton been rejected from continuing Vice Chancellor. While in that office, Mr. Langton could come to Toronto and provide for any sort of expenditure out of the University Funds, and then go to Quebec and audit and pass the accounts of them. In the investigation of this public question, the Committee of which you were Chairman, ordered that the expenses of both sides should be equally paid; but Messrs. Langton and Wilson have resorted to the University chest for supplies in their renewed effort to assail me and defeat the advocates of University reform. Mr. Langton, who is known to be the greatest pluralist in Canada—having filled four offices besides the one which is supposed to occupy him fully, and for which he receives a full salary —might, I think, have spared the University funds in this instance, if Dr. Wilson had no such sense of propriety and fairness. Of this I am confident, that had I proposed to do the same thing as to my speech in behalf of the petitioners, Mr. Langton would have held it unlawful, as is his and Dr. Wilson's proceeding in publishing their speeches and notes out of the income of the University. They may pervert the University Act to such a purpose, as it has been to many similar purposes; but such clearly was not its design. And it is an insult as well as a wrong to the petitioners of University reform and their representatives, for Mr. Langton and Dr. Wilson to assume a right and use of University funds for their personal and party purposes against others equally and more disinterestedly concerned in the National University than themselves.

(Mr. Langton and Dr. Wilson's Amalgamation Speeches.)

My second remark is, that these speeches are the same which Messrs. Langton and Wilson published last May and June. They were then published separately and without notes; but they seemed to fall still-born. The authors appear at length, to have thought that the two abortions might, by incorporation together, and by swathing the feebler parts with the bandages of personal and vituparative notes, be metamorphosed into a very Hercules of strength to crush the Chief Superintendent of Education. The thought was an ingenious conception of necessity; but the new-born amalgamation seems not answerable to the labour of bringing forth. The law of nature is still too strong for the feeble artifice of the ex-Vice Chancellor and his attendant Professor; for even "in this Canada of ours," two blacks cannot make one white, or even chemical affinity add to the weight of volatile particles.

(Origin of Personalities—Summary View of the Question.)

My third remark is, that this discussion ought never to have been encumbered with personalities. This feature of the discussion was introduced by Dr. Wilson, and has been pursued by him and Mr. Langton

with relentless tenacity in order to divert attention from the great principles and merits of the question. Dr. Wilson in his last paper laid before the Committee, says, in reference to his speech, (which commenced the personalities of the discussion) "On obtaining permission to address you," "I felt it to be my duty to show to the committee that, neither by previous education, by special training or experience, nor by fidelity to the trust reposed in him as a member of the Senate of the University, does Dr. Ryerson merit the confidence of the Committee, or of the Province, as a fit adviser on a system of University education." This is Dr. Wilson's own admission and avowal of having turned attention from the merits of the question to the demerits of Dr. Ryerson. Hence the painful necessity of my answering these personal attacks (which are renewed in the notes of the new pamphlet by Mr. Langton and Dr. Wilson) while discussing the general question. But that the reader may, at the outset, understand the whole question, (apart from any personalities,) I will conclude this introductory letter by giving a summary view of it. The advocates of University reform maintain the following positions:

1. That there shall be a National University for Upper Canada, as was contemplated by the University Act of 1853,

2. That the Senate of the University shall be under the control of no one college more than another; shall be independent of all colleges, and prescribe the standard and course of studies for all colleges (except in Divinity), and direct the examinations, and confer the University honors and degrees on the students of all the colleges.

3. That no college connected with the University shall confer degrees in the Faculties of Arts, Law, or Medicine; that no college shall receive any public aid for the support of a Faculty or Professor of Divinity.

4. That each college connected with the University, (whether denominational or non-denominational) shall be entitled to public aid from the University Fund according to the number of its students matriculated (not by such college but) by the University, and taught in the course of studies prescribed by the University: provided that a stipulated sum adequate for the efficient support of University College at Toronto, as the college of those who wished to have their youth educated in a non-denominational college be allowed; and provided that no denominational college shall receive more than half the amount allowed to University College. This last is a generous concession on the part of the advocates of denominational colleges, upon the ground that those colleges will do as much work at half the public expense as a non-denominational college will.

5. That the public provision for University (as for Common or Grammar School) education, whether arising from the sale of lands or parliamentary grants, or both, shall constitute one University Fund, and distributed, as in the case of Common and Grammar Schools, to each college according to its works in imparting the education prescribed by national authority.

The advocates of University Reform complain that the present system of college monopoly at Toronto is at variance with the intentions of the University Act of 1853; that most extravagant expenditures of the University endowment have been made, while the standard of University education has been greatly reduced, instead of being kept up as intended

by the act. They claim that the reform which they advocate is but the faithful carrying out of the avowed intentions and provisions of the University Act of 1853; that it provides one high standard of education for all the colleges, and recognizes the equal rights of all classes according to their works; that it combines the efforts of all denominations, as well as those of no denomination, in the great work of liberal education; that it will contribute greatly to the extension of University education, while elevating its character; that it is in harmony with the fundamental principles of our public school system—the state aiding each section of the community according to its works in teaching the prescribed subjects of public education, and providing that parents and the clergy of each church can in the one case as well as in the other, according to the nature and circumstances of each kind of education, provide for the religious instruction and oversight of their sons while taught the secular branches of education. The illustrations and proofs of these statements will be given hereafter.

The sole plea for the present system of monopoly is the pretext of keeping up a high standard of University education, while the whole course of the proceedings of its managers has been to lower that standard beyond all authoritative precedent or parallel, as I shall *demonstrate* in my next two letters.

I have, &c.,

E. RYERSON.

Toronto, March 26th, 1861.

LETTER II.

SIR,—I now proceed to particulars, and address myself first to the notes appended to Mr. Langton's speech, which occupies (with its appendices) the first fifty pages of the pamphlet.

(*Misstatement as to Dr. Barrett representing Victoria College in the Senate.*)

To all that Mr. Langton has said in the first twelve pages of his speech about the intentions of the University Act as to buildings, other Colleges, Library and Museum, I have fully replied in my Defence of the Petitioners; but in a note on the 8th page, in regard to Dr. Barrett (of U. C. College) sitting in the Senate as a Representative of Victoria College, Mr. Langton says—"Dr. Wilson and Mr. Langton never said that he (Dr. Barrett) now represents Victoria College; but they said that he first took his seat and for some time sat there as President of the Toronto School of Medicine, which was at that time the Medical Faculty of Victoria." And on page 62, Dr. Wilson says, that "Dr. Barrett, it is well known, never had a seat in the Senate in any other capacity than as Dr. Rolph's or the Toronto School of Medicine; and who as such took his seat for the first time to represent the Medical Faculty of Victoria College at the meetings of the University of Toronto, while its students were systematically prevented from graduating there." The character in which Dr. Barrett took his seat in the Senate is not of the least importance to the University question; but Mr. Langton and Dr. Wilson both magnifying

it into so much importance, shows how, in their paucity of materials of justification, they have laid hold of the most trivial circumstance that could be construed into a show of plausibility in their favour. I will now demonstrate the absurdity and groundlessness of their assertions. In the first place, Dr. Barrett never did and never could sit in the Senate "to represent the Medical Faculty of Victoria College;" and no man should know this better than Mr. Langton himself. When the Senate was constituted in 1854, the Governor in Council appointed certain persons by name as members, and certain others by office. Of the latter class were the Chief Superintendent of Education, Presidents of several Colleges named, and the *President of the Toronto School of Medicine*, which was then by the Governor admitted on application as an affiliated College of the University; and it has remained so ever since. As President of the Toronto School of Medicine Dr. Workman took his seat in the Senate. That was long before the Medical Faculty of Victoria College was in existence. When Dr. Workman resigned his place as President of the Toronto School of Medicine, Dr. Barrett was elected in his place, and as his successor took his seat, and as such occupies it to this day. Nearly a year after the President of the Toronto School of Medicine took his seat in the Senate, one of its Professors appeared before the Board of Victoria College, and sought on behalf of himself and colleagues to be recognized as the Medical Faculty of Victoria College. The application was entertained; but Dr. Barrett has declared, and it appears made oath before the Court of Chancery that the Toronto School of Medicine never did become the Medical Faculty of Victoria College, and the Court has so decided. Yet in the presence of these facts, Mr. Langton and Dr. Wilson state that "Dr. Barrett took his seat to represent the Medical Faculty of Victoria College!"

(Scholarships—Mr. Langton answered.)

To Mr. Langton's lengthened observations and tabular sophistry on Scholarships in the English and Irish Universities and Colleges, I have amply replied in my Defence of the Petitioners; and the criticisms in his notes on the 19th page do not in the least weaken the force of the English documentary authorities by which I established my positions. On the contrary, any one who, after having read Mr. Langton's criticisms, will turn to my statements and authorities (pp. 20–23 of the Quebec edition, or pp. 36, 37 of the Toronto edition of my Defence of the Petitioners,) will be the more confirmed in their conclusiveness. Dr. Wilson quotes the remarks of the Rev. Provost Whitaker, that the case of Scholarships in the English Universities and Canada is so unlike, that there is no analogy. That was my chief argument in reply to Mr. Langton and Dr. Wilson; and I therefore showed that Mr. Langton's references and statements as to Scholarships in England and Ireland, were fallacious and irrelevant. I shall also have more to say on this subject, as also on several other topics over which I now pass, in my concluding General Observations.

(Standard of Matriculation—Mr. Langton's statements corrected and refuted.)

On no subject have Mr. Langton and Dr. Wilson evinced more

sensitiveness (as well they might) than under the withering exposures made as to the reduction of the standard of Matriculation or admission into the University; and no efforts have been spared by them to justify its necessity and mitigate its enormity. When the proof of it could no longer be resisted, it was then alleged that the former high standard had been loudly complained of, and a reduction demanded. On the contrary, the existence of any such complaint or demand was denied, and Mr. Langton was challenged to adduce a sigle instance of it in any newspaper, document, letter, or by any witness. He could adduce none; and in disproof of his statement, it was shown that during the four years' existence of Mr. Baldwin's University Act from 1849 to 1853, no reduction was made or proposed; that in 1854, when the whole course of studies was revised under the present Act, not only was no reduction made in the standard of matriculation, but it was rather raised by the addition of the elements of Chemistry and Natural Philosophy. Nothing is left but for Mr. Langton to repeat his unsupported assertion that the former standard was too high, and to employ specious references and comparisons to justify that assertion. One of these references is, that students are sometimes matriculated into an English University on the certificate of a graduate master; another, that the candidate is tested by being examined in one Greek and one Latin author, to which is added "some facility in Latin writing, and a fair acquaintance with the grammatical principles of Greek and Latin," arithmetic and a portion of the elements of Euclid. Now the fallacy of these references will appear from two facts. The one is, that the standard of admission to the English Universities has been as definitely established by the practice of ages as the standard of morality, and a graduate master would no more jeopard his character by giving a false certificate than would a College Tutor or University Professor. The second fact is, that the same words and phrases are used in very different senses at Oxford and at Toronto. What is called wealth in Canada and gives its possessor the entrée to the first society is but slender competence in England. So the test of examination in a Greek or Latin author at Oxford and Toronto is as different as day is from night; and what is there regarded as "some facility in Latin writing" for matriculation, is regarded here as ample for graduation, and perhaps with honours and a scholarship, as I shall show in another place. Besides, the attainments of boys in the *Forms* of Rugby or other Grammar Schools in England are as accurately defined by long usage as are the attainments of students at a degree examination in the University. But I will mention one fact, which all can understand, and admits of no cavilling. The usual age of a boy on going to the famous Rugby Grammar School is eleven years, and the usual period of his continuing there his preparations for the University is *eight years*. In that interesting book, "*Tom Brown's School Days at Rugby*," the author, in the last chapter, describes his hero as leaving Rugby, after eight years' residence there under the care of the then recently deceased and lamented Head Master, the loved and great Dr. ARNOLD. But with

us,a boy will go through both the Grammar School and University,too in eight years, and some in six! Yet it takes as clever a lad as Tom Brown, and in so famed a School as Rugby, and under so unrivalled a Master as Dr. Arnold, eight years to prepare for admission into the Oxford University! This single fact speaks volumes as to the immense inferiority of the standard of admission and studies in the Toronto University to that of Oxford, and the folly and self-contradiction of Mr. Langton and Dr. Wilson pretending at the same time that the standard of admission and degree in the Toronto University is equal to that of the English Universities!

(Mr. Langton's statements as to Dr. Ryerson and the incompetency of the Masters of Grammar Schools corrected, and his injurious and downward policy exposed.)

In justification of the great reduction of a year's work in the standard of matriculation, Mr. Langton represented me as having supported it. I affirmed the reverse. In a note (p. 26) Mr. Langton says, "Dr. Ryerson states that he never was in favour of reducing the Matriculation Examination. Let him have the benefit of his denial, though there are many persons who have a different recollection." On this insinuation, I remark, that during the session of the Senate referred to (1854) the standard of Matriculation was settled the same as it had been in the time of King's College, with the addition of the elements of chemistry and natural philosophy, notwithstanding the efforts of Mr. Langton and others to reduce it. I remark further, that after my return from Quebec last year I addressed a note on the subject to the President of University College. My note and his reply are as follows, and speak for themselves:

"Toronto, June 2, 1860.

"My Dear Sir,—As you were Vice-Chancellor, as well as member of the Senate of the Toronto University in 1854, when the whole course of studies was largely discussed and revised, I will thank you to inform me whether you recollect of my having advocated or opposed the reduction of the standard of matriculation at the University.

"Yours very faithfully,

(Signed) "E. Ryerson.

"The Rev. Dr. McCaul, President of University College, Toronto.

Dr. McCaul's answer to the foregoing note—

"Univ. Coll., Toronto, June 11, 1860.

"My Dear Sir,—I have delayed answering your note, as I wished to refresh my memory by consulting the Minute Book of the Senate. But as it has not yet been received from Quebec, and as I do not wish to defer applying to your query I write to state, that, so far as I recollect, you never suggested or supported any proposition for the reduction of the standard of matriculation.

"Yours faithfully,

"John McCaul.

"The Rev. Dr. Ryerson."

Mr. Langton's next plea for reducing the standard of matriculation, was the incompetency of the masters of the Grammar Schools. This I denied and gave my reasons. On this Mr. Langton, in a note on page 26, remarks—"Dr. Ryerson, in his reply, produces the names of about a dozen Grammar School Masters who are fully competent for their important

functions, which is readily admitted by every one; but the inferior condition of the seventy five schools as a whole, from the inadequacy of remuneration, is as universally acknowledged." In these words Mr. Langton clearly conveys the impression, that I represented only twelve Masters of Grammar Schools as competent to prepare pupils for the University according to the old standard of matriculation. Suppose this were so, are not twelve Grammar Schools ample feeders for one College? and is it not a wrong to those twelve Grammar Schools to take away from them their best year's work and their highest importance, and transfer that year's Grammar School work to the one College by the reduction of its curriculum and the corresponding diminution of its value and completeness? But Mr. Langton's words misrepresent my statement and the facts of the case. After having enumerated some twelve Masters by name, as Mr. Langton states, I proceeded as follows: "I might extend this enumeration a long while; for the Masters of no less than forty-two of the Grammar Schools are graduates of British and Canadian Colleges; and several of those who teach under Provincial certificates, are competent and able teachers. Sir, the plea of Mr. Langton and Dr. Wilson as to the incompetency of the Grammar Schools, is an unjust and groundless imputation upon the qualificationsof the great majority of the Masters of Grammar Schools in Upper Canada: for however poor may be the accommodations of Grammar Schools in some places, and however inadeqate the salaries paid, it is clear that the *Masters generally are competent to train our boys to any standard of matriculation a Provincial University might require.* The reason given for the reduction is a mere pretext, contradicted on the one hand by the consideration of the objects for which Upper Canada College was founded, and on the other by the competency of the Grammar Schools in various parts of the Province. It is for the want of those who wish to pursue a course of University study, that men have not come to enrol themselves on the University books; and perhaps another reason is, the unwillingness of some to go up to Toronto. Every effort has been made by offering prizes and scholarships, by abolishing fees, by the reduction of the standard, to increase the number of the students; and as if that were not enough, these gentlemen have attached to the University College a Tutor, whose special work it is to assist the maimed, the halt, and I had almost said the blind. Is it, I ask, for the interest of the several localities of the country, for the interest of the Grammar Schools themselves, or for that of University Education, to take off what Mr. Langton admits to be a year's work from the Grammar Schools, and tack it on to University College by the assistance of a Tutor, with the duty assigned to him of coaching those who come up from the country to enter the University even according to its present reduced standard?"

(*Mr. Langton and Dr. Wilson's backsliding policy of reduction, strongly condemned by the Queen's University Commissioners in Ireland, as most Injurious to the interests of both Grammar School and University Education.*)

Such were my statements and arguments in regard to the competency of Grammar School Masters in contradiction to what Mr. Langton's words attribute to me; and such is my statement in regard to their general competency now, notwithstanding the pressing want of well qualified teachers

in several of them. But in the Queen's University in Ireland, where the defective state of the Grammar Schools is so well known and so much lamented, and where the University standard is so much higher than it is in Toronto, so far from its being proposed to reduce the standard of matriculation, after the Toronto fashion, and thus make the University College a Superior Grammar School, and an University Education only another name for an English Grammar School Education, the Royal Commissioners of the Queen's University in Ireland in 1858, condemn, in the most explicit terms, and in words also of the late Sir. William Hamilton, the very course pursued in the Toronto University and advocated by Mr. Langton and Dr. Wilson. The Commissioners condemn the lowering of the matriculation examination by the *Cork* College, which Mr. Langton (through Mr. Meredith) adduces as an example to justify for the reduction at Toronto, and recommended that the high standard of matriculation originally fixed for all the Colleges (and still retained in Belfast College) be maintained. The Commissioners express themselves as follows:

"Preparatory to entering on the College course of study, the council has in each College prescribed Matriculation Examinations, which *now differ*, though they were *originally the same in all.*

"The Matriculation Examination is the first point of contact between the College and the School, and the only point through which the action and reaction, of each on the other, are being constantly communicated. *This Examination must, therefore, be always maintained at a high standard,* as indicating the termination of School Education, and the starting point of College studies.

"*Nothing could,* we conceive, *be more injurious to the interests of Education, than a low standard of matriculation Examination* as a preliminary qualification for college pursuits. We are of opinion, with the late Sir. William Hamilton, that '*Professorial prelections are no substitute for scholastic discipline,*' and that *the University loses its proper character* when obliged '*to stoop in order to supply the absence of competency of inferior Seminaries.*'

"We, therefore, *recommend that the Matriculation Examination be maintained at the same standard as originally fixed by the Board of Colleges;* and if any change be hereafter made therein, *that the tendency of such would always be to elevate and never depress the standard of School Education throughout the country.*"

Such is the Royal Commissioners unqualified condemnation of the recent Toronto system of reductions in the Matriculation Examinations. I regard it as the most calamitous blow which has yet fallen upon both Collegiate and Grammar School Education in Upper Canada to depress both by one entire year of studies. For example, a boy fourteen years of age, in the mid year of the fourth form of a Grammar School, having mastered more than the little Latin and Greek and Mathematics required for matriculation, is intent upon donning the cap and gown of an University Student, though it will be for his interests as well as for the reputation of the Master and that of the school for him to remain until he shall have completed the *fourth* and *fifth* forms of his Grammar School studies. This is an instance—a fact—one of many—illustrative of the

pernicious effects of this surface hot-bed system upon the Grammar School, by depressing and depriving it of its legitimate work and importance, upon the lad by putting him among men as a man, and under the prelections of the Professor, when he ought to be with boys in the exercises and studies of the Grammar School, and upon the University College in reducing it to a higher Grammar School: for in comparing the courses of studies in Toronto University College and in the Rugby Grammar School in England, I find that the classical course of the latter is considerably higher than that of the former; so that Tom Brown left Rugby for the University a better classical scholar than a Tom Brown would leave Toronto University College with the degree of A. B.* This

* But as there is nothing like *facts*, I will give the facts themselves. No thorough University Education can be given within the usual period of four years which commences with a low standard of Matriculation. The remarks on this point of the Royal Commissioners to enquire into the state of Queen's University in Ireland are conclusive The whole question of thorough University Education is, therefore, mainly involved in the *standard of Matriculation*, and in the *system of options*. I will here give the programme of studies in the *Rugby Grammar School* (one of the 475 endowed Grammar Schools in England) furnished to the English *Journal of Education*, (vol vii., pp. 225-227,) by the late Dr. Arnold himself, than whom the present century has not produced a more practical, thorough, and successful instructor of youth. With a view of preserving the *sixth form* (so noted in England) subdivisions are made in some of the others. A boy remains on an average a year (sometimes more) in each of the eight classes or forms. It is after completing the studies of the sixth form, (or eighth class), that boys go to Oxford or Cambridge University. This will serve as a specimen of the standard which usage has established for matriculation into the English Universities, though doubtless many idle and inferior boys are got in there, and go out in the poll. After a youth has gone through such a Grammar School course of studies, the certificate of the master might be safely substituted for a matriculation examination at the University, or the attainments of the candidate can be easily tested by a single book and composition. But what a contrast does the following programme of studies present to the standard of Matriculation into the Toronto University! And how utterly absurd and preposterous are Mr. Langton's assertions and attempts to show that the standard of matriculation here is equal to that of the English Universities! And even the following programme, as the learned and lamented author explains, does not include the exercises in Greek and Latin prose and verse which are required.

PROGRAMME OF STUDIES IN THE RUGBY GRAMMAR SCHOOL, (ENGLAND,) BY THE LATE REV. DR. ARNOLD, HEAD MASTER.

FIRST FORM.

Classical Division.—*Language time.* Latin grammar and delectus. *History time.* Markham's England, vol. i. *Scriptural instruction, &c.* Church catechism and abridgment of New Testament History.

Mathematical Division. Table. Addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division, simple and compound. Reduction.

French division. Hamel's Exercises, up to the auxiliary verbs.

SECOND FORM.

Classical division. *Language time.* Latin grammar and Latin Delectus Eutropius. *History time.* Markham's England, vol. ii. *Scriptural instruction, &c.* St. Luke. Genesis.

Mathematical division. The work done in the first form repeated. Rule of three. Practice.

is a humiliating state of things, and presents a melancholy prospect, as the fruit of the attempts during the last four years to swamp the other Colleges by free tuition and many options, scholarships, and prizes in Toronto College, and by "stooping with considerate kindness to the level of the crowd," as the Rev. Dr. Lillie stated and eulogized the Toronto system for doing, in a speech delivered at Montreal in June last, on the University question.

Comparative View of the Standard of Matriculation into Toronto University College and other Colleges.

The Programme of Studies in Rugby Grammar School, which has been given in a note, shows the standard of preparation settled by the common law of usage for matriculation into the English Universities; for what is true of Rugby is also true of Harrow, of Winchester, of Eaton, &c.; and these institutions determine the standard at which other public or private schools or private tutors in England must prepare the pupils for the Universities, without reference to any matriculation examination. Mr. Bristed's book of his five years' experience in an English University after

---

FRENCH DIVISION. Hamel's Exercises. Auxiliary verbs. Regular conjugations and some of the irregular. Gaultier's Geography.

THIRD FORM.

CLASSICAL DIVISION.—*Language time.* Greek grammar (Matthiæ, Abridgment.) Valpy's Greek. Exercises. Valpy's Greek Delectus. Florilegium. Translations into Latin. *History time.* Eutropius. Physical geography. (Useful Knowledge Society.) *Scriptural instruction, &c.* Exodus. Numbers. Judges, i. and ii. Samuel. St. Matthew.

MATHEMATICAL DIVISION. Rule of three. Practice. Vulgar fractions. Interest.

FRENCH DIVISION. Hamel's Exercises, first part, continued. Irregular verbs. Elizabeth, ou les Exiles en Sibérie.

LOWER REMOVE.

CLASSICAL DIVISION. *Language time.* Greek grammar and Valpy's Exercises. Rules of the Greek Iambics. Easy parts of the Iambics of the Greek tragegians. Virgil's Eclogues. Cicero de Senectute. *History time.* Parts of Justin. Parts of Xenophon's Anabasis. Markham's France, to Philip Valois. *Scriptural instruction, &c.* St. Matthew, in Greek Testament. Acts, in the English Bible.

MATHEMATICAL DIVISION. Vulgar fractions. Interest. Decimal fractions. Square root.

FRENCH DIVISION. Hamel continued and repeated. Jussiu's Jardin des Plantes.

FOURTH FORM.

CLASSICAL DIVISION. *Language time.* Æschylus, Prometh. Virgil, Æn. ii. and iii. Cicero de Amicitâ. *History time.* Part of Xenophon's Hellenics. Florus from iii. 21. 21 to iv. 11. History of Greece. (U. K. S.) Markam's France, from Philip of Valois. Detailed geography of Italy and Germany. *Scriptural instruction, &c.* Acts, in the Greek Testament. St. John, in the English Bible. Old Testament History.

MATHEMATICAL DIVISION. Decimals. Ivolution and evolution. Addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division of algebra. Binomial theorem. Euclid, Book i. Prop. 1 to 15.

FRENCH DIVISION. Hamel's Second Part, chiefly, chiefly syntax of the pronouns. La Fontaine's Fable's.

UPPER REMOVE.

CLASSICAL DIVISION. *Language time.* Sophocles' Philoct Æschyl. Eumenid.

having graduated at Yale College in the United States, furnishes ample proof to the same effect. It was maintained, at least to within a recent date, that the standard of maticulation in the London University was quite as high as that at Oxford or Cambridge. This was the avowal and understanding when the Toronto University Act of 1853 was passed. But in Ireland, as in America, where the Grammar Schools and Academies have not the same defined course of study as the English Grammar Schools, and where settled usage has not fixed the period at which the pupils proceed from them to the University, a more specific and strict matriculation examination is required. Mr. Langton admits that the Queen's University in Ireland furnishes the latest, freest and fullest expression of practical Educationists and the Government, as to what the present age requires an University education to be. I have shown that the Queen's University Commissioners in Ireland in 1858, condemned the reduction in the standard of matriculation in Queen's College, Cork, and required the original standard of matriculation, then and still retained in Queen's College, Belfast. It is worthy of remark, that Cork College Council had adopted precisely the classical standard of matriculation which has been adopted at Toronto, with the exception of not retaining the chapter of the Cataline Conspiracy.

Homer's Iliad, i., ii. Virgil, Æn, iv., v. Parts of Horace, Odes, i., ii., iii. Parts of Cicero's Epistles. *History time.* Parts of Arrian. Parts of Paterculus. Book ii. Sir J. Mackintosh's England. *Scriptural instruction.* St. John, in Greek Testament. Deuteronomy and Epistle of St. Peter. Selections from the Psalms.

MATHEMATICAL DIVISION. Equation of payments. Discount. Simple equations. Euclid, Book i., from 15 to end.

FRENCH DIVISION. Translation from English into French. La Fontaine's Fables.

LOWER FIFTH.

CLASSICAL DIVISION.—*Language time.* Æschyl. Sept. Contra Thebas. Sophocles, Œd. Tyr. Homer's Iliad, iii., iv. Virgil's Æneid, vi., vii. Extracts from Cicero's Epistles. Parts of Horace. *History time.* Parts of Arrian. Herodotus, iii., 1, 38, 61, 67, 88, 116. Livy, parts of ii. and iii. Hallam's Middle Ages. France, Spain, Greeks, and Saracens. Physical and Political Geography of all Europe. *Scriptural Instruction.* St. John. Epistles to Timothy and Titus. Bible history, from 1 Kings to Nehemiah, inclusive.

MATHEMATICAL DIVISION. Exchange. Allegation. Simple equations with two unknown qualities, and problemns. Euclid, Book iii.

FRENCH DIVISION. Syntax and idioms. A play of Molière, to construe, and then to turn from English into French.

FIFTH FORM.

CLASSICAL DIVISION. *Language time.* Æschyl. Agamemnon. Homer's Iliad, v., vi.; Odyssey, ix. Demosthenes' Leptines in Aphobum i. Virgil's Æn. viii. Parts of Horace. Cicero in Verrem. *History time.* Parts of Herodotus and Thucydides. Parts of Livy. Hallam's Middle Ages. State of Society. *Scriptural instruction, &c.* Epistles to the Corinthians. Paley's Horæ Paulinæ.

MATHEMATICAL DIVISION. Quadratic equations. Trigonomotry. Eclid, to the end of Book vi.

FRENCH DIVISION. Pensees de Pascal. Translations from the English into French.

SIXTH FORM.

CLASSICAL DIVISION. *Language time.* Various parts of Virgil and Homer. Some one or more of the Greek tragedies. One or more of the private orations

This reduction of the matriculation examination the Commissioners condemned as most injurious to the interests of both Grammar Schools and of University education. Now the classical matriculation examination required by the Royal Commissioners, as essential to University education in the Queen's Colleges in Ireland, includes the following books:—Virgil's Æneid, books I, II, III, IV: Livy, books I, II; Homer's Iliad, books I, II; Xenophon's Anabasis, two books; with translations into Latin. While, at Toronto, the only classical books in which examination is required, are, one book of the Anabasis, one book of Virgil's Æneid, and Sallust's Conspiracy of Cataline: a full year behind the Queen's Colleges in Ireland,

Then Harvard College in the U.S., which Mr. Bristed says is much below that of the English Universities, (as indeed the preparatory programme of studies at Rugby shows) prescribes a matriculation examination including the following books and subjects; as specified in its official Calendar and Catalogue for 1860–61:

REQUISITES FOR ADMISSION.

Candidates for admission to the Freshman Class are examined the following books:—

LATIN DEPARTMENT.

The whole of Virgil,
The whole of Cæsar's Commentaries,
Cicero's Select Orations, Folsom's or Johnson's edition,
Andrews and Stoddard's Latin Grammar, including Prosody,
And in writing Latin.

GREEK DEPARTMENT.

Felton's Greek Reader, or the whole of the Anabasis of Xenophon and the first three books of the Iliad (omitting the Catalogue of Ships in the second book),
Sophocles's Greek Grammar, or Crosby's, or Hadley's, including Prosody,
And in writing Greek with the Accents.

MATHEMATICAL DEPARTMENT.

Davies', Chases, or Eaton's Arithmetic,
Euler's Algebra, or Davies's Frst Lessons in Algebra, to "The Extraction of the Square Root," or Sherwin's Common School Algebra,
And "An Introduction to Geometry and the Science of Form, prepared from the most approved Prussian Text-Books," as far as the Seventh Section, or Hill's "First Lessons in Geometry."

HISTORICAL DEPARTMENT.

Mitchell's Ancient and Modern Geography,
Worcester's Elements of History,—the Ancient History only.
[After 1861, Smith's Smaller History of Greece, or Sewell's History of Greece will be substituted for so much of Worcester's History as relates to Greece.]

---

of Demosthenes. Cicero against Verres. Parts of Aristotle's ethics. *History time*. Parts of Thucydides and Arrian. Parts of Tacitus. Parts of Russell's Modern Europe. *Scriptural instruction, &c.* One of the prophets in the Septuagint version. Different parts of the New Testament.

MATHEMATICAL DIVISION. Euclid, iii., vi. Simple and quadratic equations. Plane trigonometry. Conic sections.

FRENCH DIVISION. Parts of Guizot's Historie de la Revolution d'Angleterre, and Mignet's Historie de la Revolut. Français."

The standard of matriculation into *Yale College* (New-Haven) is as follows, as stated in the official Catalogue for

TERMS OF ADMISSION.

Candidates for admission to the Freshman Class are examined in the following books and subjects :—

Cicero—seven Orations.
Virgil—the Bucolics, Georgics, and the first six books of the Æneid.
Sallust—Catilinarian and Jugurthine Wars.
Latin Grammar—Andrews and Stoddard, or Zumpt.
Latin Prosody.
Arnold's Latin Prose Composition, to the Passive voice, (first XII Chapters).
Greek Reader—Jacobs, Colton, or Felton.
Xenophon—Anabasis, first three bookst
Greek Grammar—Sophocles, Crosby, or Kuhner.
Thomson's Higher Arithmetic.
Day's Algebra, (Revised Edition), to Quadratic Equations.
Playfair's Euclid, first two books.
English Grammar.
Geography.

The standard of matriculation into the Toronto University in 1852, was as follows, as reported in Appendix L. to the Journals of the Legislative Assembly for 1852–3 :

"By a Statute by the Senate in 1851, the following have been appointed as the subjects of examination for candidates of admission :

"CLASSICS, &c.—Homer, Illiad, B. I.; Xenophon, Anabasis, B. I.; Lucian, Charon and Vita; Virgil Æneid, B. VI.; Ovid, Fasti, B. I.; Cæsar de Bello Gall. Bk. V. and VI.; Translation from English into Latin Prose; English Composition; English History to the present time; Roman History to the accession of Augustus; Grecian History to the death of Alexander; Outlines of Ancient and Modern Geography.

"MATHEMATICS.—First Four Rules of Arithmetic; Vulgar and Decimal Fractions; Extraction of Square Root; First Four Rules of Algebra; Proportion and Progressions; Simple Equations; Euclid, B. I."

Observe this was the standard of matriculation not merely of old King's College, but of the Toronto University created by Mr. Baldwin's Act of 1849, and of which the late Hon. de Blaquiere was Chancellor, and I was myself a member, and from which the old founders of King's College had withdrawn. In 1854, the course of studies was revised by the new Senate under the present University Act; but the former standard of matriculation was retained unaltered, with the exception that, the first book of Ovid's Fasti was omitted, and *or* was inserted before Lucian, and Nero was substituted for Augustus, and the Elements of Chemistry and Natural Philosophy were added—making upon the whole, the standard higher than before. This standard remained unchanged until 1857, when Mr. Langton and Dr. Wilson combined to lower the standard and multiply options in order to break down the other Colleges and fill Toronto College by reducing admission to it "to a level with the crowd." The only *classics* required by their statute of 1857 were Sallust's Cataline, and the first book of the Anabasis, and a nominal exercise in Latin composition. They have since been prompted into adding one book of Virgil's Æneid; but how deplorably low does this appear in comparison with the standard of admission to the English Universities as shown by the Rugby

preparatory programme of studies; in comparison with the standard of admission to the Queen's Colleges in Ireland as required, after renewed deliberation and experience, by the Royal Commissioners in 1858; in comparison with the standard of admission to Harvard and Yale Colleges, though Mr. Bristed represents the standard of these as much lower than that of the English Universities: in comparison with King's College and Toronto University down to 1857, though that was lower than the standards of Harvard and Yale, and of course lower than that of the English Universities. During fifteen years from 1842 to 1857,—under three successive Acts and Senates the standard of matriculation was maintained until brought down one whole year by the levelling and diluting system devised by Mr. Langton and Dr. Wilson. How the reverse is such a course to the recommendation of the Queen's commissioners in regard to the high standard of matriculation first established in the Irish College, when they said—"We recommend that the matriculation examination be maintained at the same standard as originally fixed by the Board of Colleges, and if any change be hereafter made therein, that the tendency should always be to elevate and never to depress the general standard of education throughout the country."*

The great importance of this question of Matriculation Examination, and the fallacies resorted to justify the abasement of the University to its present low level, have required me to multiply authorities and illustrations beyond what I had at first intended. JUNIUS says, "the plain evidence of facts is superior to all declarations!" I trust the facts and examples I have adduced will put it out of the power of Mr. Langton and Dr. Wilson again to obscure this question and will settle their "declarations" at their true value.

I have, &c.,

E. RYERSON.

Toronto, March 27th, 1861.

* In the paucity of materials for argument, Mr. Langton and Dr. Wilson have sought to convict me of inconsistency in having agreed to a standard of matriculation not much higher than that of Toronto in a project of an University for New Brunswick several years since. It may answer their purpose to turn attention from the merits of the question to me, but my consistency or inconsistency has nothing to do with a question of law and of facts. What was intended by passing the University Act of 1853, and what has been done by the Senate of the University as to the standard of college education since 1842, depends not upon anything relative to myself. I have no documents or papers to call to my recollection as to what recommendations the College Commissioners for New Brunswick agreed upon, though at their request I prepared their report and draft of Bill. But what might be expedient for New Brunswick has nothing to do with law and fact, and expediency in Canada. The simple facts here are, that the spirit and phraseology of the University act of 1853 was clearly to elevate the standard of University education above what it then was, as well as to extend its advantages wider, while the whole tendency of Mr. Langton and Dr. Wilson's policy during the last four years has been to lower the standard of University Education, beyond precedent, to the injury of both liberal and grammar school education in the country. But I may observe, that in 1842—before University or old King's College was in existence—Victoria College was opened as an University College; I was appointed Principal; and in the course of University studies then prepared and adopted, the matriculation examination was as high as that adopted for Toronto University in 1854, and in Latin considerably higher.

Letter III.

(*Options, or the choice of some University Studies and Omission of others.*)

Sir,—After the Standard of matriculation, the next subject of vital importance in the course of University studies is that of *Options*. The substance of Mr. Langton's argument on this subject is, that the English Universities allow options; Toronto University allows options; therefore the options of Toronto University are justified by the example and authority of the English Universities. A student who has not got the length of the Fallacies in Whatley's Logic (a text book used in Victoria College) but has merely mastered the little manual used in the University College, might easily detect the fallacy of Mr. Langton's reasoning. As well may it be said, England has Universities, statesmen, scholars; so has Canada; therefore England and Canada are identical or equal in Universities, statesmen, and scholars. Now it happens that *options* in the English and Toronto Universities, are as different as are their standards of matriculation. The course of studies is four years in the English Universities, as in the Toronto University, and three years in the Queen's Colleges in Ireland. The options commence in the Toronto University with honor when at the end of the *first* year, with students who do not take honors at the end of the second year; but in the Irish Colleges and in the English Universities options are not allowed to students until the *third* year. In the copious notes which Mr. Langton has appended to his speech, I look in vain for any answer to my Reply to it in defence of the Petitioners. He had affirmed that the options were as early and as numerous in the English Universities as in that of Toronto, and he had adduced the report of the University Commissioners recommending options, as he expressed, "during the latter period of their career,"—thereby conveying the impression that the options were the same there as here; In reply, I observed that the options here commenced at the end of *one fourth* of the course, while in Oxford it was not allowed until the expiration of *three fourths* of the course; and that if Mr. Langton had quoted the words, or even the heading of the chapter of the Commissioners Report, making their recommendators, the fallacy of his references would have been made apparent at once. He employed the indefinite phrase "latter part of their career," while the words of their report were, "Liberty of choice in studies during the *last year*"—not during the *last three* out of the four years as at Toronto. In justification of this vagueness, Mr. Langton remarks in a note on the 37th page, that—"If Mr. Langton had spoken as precisely as Dr. Ryerson wishes him to do, he would not have spoken truly." I reply, that I desired him to speak only as precisely as the Report which he professed to quote. If he did not intend to convey a different impression from the Commissioners' Report itself, why did he say the "latter part of their career," instead of the "last year," as the Report expressed it; for surely the words of the Report are shorter and fewer than those employed by Mr. Langton. Mr. Langton's design in varying the phraseology cannot be mistaken. The period during which undergraduates at Oxford might exercise the liberty of choice in studies might vary, and therefore be

indefinite; but that choice did not extend beyond "the last year," according to the Report, and not over three years, as at Toronto, as Mr. Langton adduced it to justify.

Mr. Langton resorts to the same kind of fallacy in his notes to his speech. His object is to justify the early and sweeping options in the Toronto University, and in doing so he appeals to the fact that after the "*Intermediate Examination*" at Oxford, and after "*Previous Examination*" at Cambridge, options or a choice of certain studies, and the omission of others, are allowed; but he is careful not to explain the meaning of those terms, or the nature of those examinations, and thus endeavours to impress the reader that the options at Oxford and Cambridge are the same as at Toronto: whereas, if he had stated the fact, that the "Intermediate Examination" at Oxford and the "Previous Examination" at Cambridge, are higher than the degree examination at Toronto, he would have refuted his own argument and proved the truth of mine. Yet such is the fact, as I will now prove.

The Rev. Mr. Ambery—an honour Oxford man—was examined before the Committee at Quebec. Neither Mr. Langton nor Dr. Wilson has ventured to question his testimony. The following are the questions proposed to Mr. Ambery and his answers on this subject:

"What examination at Oxford corresponds with a matriculation examination in the Toronto University? There is no technical examination at Oxford. The Commissioners recommend that the previous examinations or responsions should be put forward very early in the academical course, so as to serve in reality in place of a matriculation examination.

"To what examination in the Toronto University do you think the first examination or responsions at Oxford is equal? If the subjects for the pass degree examination at Toronto are those fixed on for the fourth year, I consider that the previous examination at Oxford is equal to that examination in Upper Canada.

"To what examination in the Toronto University do you think the first public examination, [Intermediate Examination] or Moderations, at Oxford is equal?—I think the first examination for Moderations may be a little inferior to the Honour Examinations for degrees, and the Honour Examination for Moderations at Oxford to be very greatly superior". (Mr. Ambery's evidence is quoted as corrected by himself.)

Such are the two examinations at Oxford, which precede the final degree examinations. It will be seen that, in Mr. Ambery's opinion, the first, or matriculation examination (called responsions) at Oxford, is equal to a pass degree examination at Toronto; and that the second public examination there, (called Moderations) is nearly equal to an *honour* degree examination at Toronto.

As to Cambridge, the Rev. Mr. *Whitaker* (who had taken honours at Cambridge) was examined as follows before the Committee on this subject:

"What is the standard of the *previous examination* at Cambridge as compared with the second year at Toronto? It is considerably higher. At the time the change was introduced, *a considerable addition was made to the subjects of the previous examination, which made it nearly, if not quite equal to the former examination for a common Degree.*

"The system of options thus established at Cambridge does not commence there till students have arrived at attainments equal to those formerly required for taking a degree?—I should say so."

The reader will understand from the above extracts of the evidence of the Rev. Mr. Ambery and the Rev. Provost Whitaker, what is meant by the *Intermediate* Examination, or Moderations, at Oxford, and the *Previous Examination* at Cambridge; and that the former is higher than that required for a degree at Toronto, and that the latter is equal to the former examination for B. A. at Cambridge. And it is not until after they have passed those examinations (higher than degree examinations here) that under-graduates at Oxford and Cambridge are allowed to take options at all. What a contrast to the Toronto system!

If we turn to the London University, there are no options whatever, either for ordinary or honor students, in the examinations for B.A. It is only when the candidates come up for examination for M. A. that they are allowed options or choice of subjects.

In the Queen's Colleges in Ireland, no options whatever are allowed until the *third or last year* of the course.

I will now illustrate and establish the foregoing statements by examples and proofs. I have already remarked upon the comparative *standards of matriculation*, and upon the periods in the courses of study at which *options* are allowed at Toronto, in England and New England; but it is more material to show the amount of work done and the standards of attainments required before options are allowed.

First, take the *London University*. In referring to its standard of matriculation I omitted to remark that it included an examination in *French* and *German*, not required at Toronto, and *four* books of Euclid, instead of one, as at Toronto,—a tolerable indication of the comparative standards of matriculation in the London and Toronto Universities in other respects. In the London University there are two B. A. examinations, one at the end of not less than one year, the other at the end of not less than two years.

The first examination includes two Latin authors, translations from English into Latin, and from English into German or French. The Calendar says,—"Candidates shall not be approved by the Examiners, unless they show a competent knowledge in

1. Latin and Roman History.
2. English Language, Literature and History.
3. Mathematics.
4. Either the French or German Languages."

The *Second* Examination for B. A. includes both a Greek and Latin author, as also translation from English into Latin; and the Calendar says, "Candidates shall not be approved unless they show a competent knowledge in

4. Classics.
2. Grecian History.
3. Natural Philosophy.
4. Animal Physiology.
5. Logic and Moral Philosophy.

These are for the *pass* examinations; and in neither of them is any options allowed.

It is not until the very severe examination for M. A. takes place (for which there is no examination in the Toronto University) that options are allowed.

Secondly, Turn to Queen's University, in Ireland; and to the classical department alone. It will be recollected that the matriculation examination includes Homer, Books I. II.; Xenophon's Anabasis, Books I. II.; Virgil's Æneid, Books I. II. III. IV.; in contrast to the Toronto matriculation examination of one book of the Anabasis, and Sallust's Cataline, and now one book of the Æneid. The subjects of the *first* year (in Queen's University) are in Latin,

Cicero—De Natura Deorum.
Cicero—De Finibus.
Juvenal.

In Greek,

Homer's Iliad, Book XII.
Æschylus—Prometheus Vinctus.
Demosthenes—Contra Midiam.

In Toronto, the subjects of the first year's classical course are the 6th Book of Virgil's Æneid, Cicero's De Amicitia, and the 6th Book of Homer's Iliad!

The subjects of the *second* year's classical studies in the Queen's University in Ireland, are, in Latin,

Tacitus—Annals, Book IV.
Plautus—Capteivei.
Horace—Epistles.
Lucretius—Book II.

In Greek,

Herodotus,—Book IV.
Aristophanes,—The Frogs.
Plato,—Timæus.

Four Latin and three Greek authors, while in Toronto University, the subjects of the *second* year's classical studies are only the 11th Book of Homer's Odessy, the Odes of Horace, and Cicero's first Oration against Cataline, and his Oration for Archias.

Now, Mr. Langton admits that no options are allowed in the Queen's University in Ireland until the third year; and he maintains that the Toronto standard is as elevated as that of the Queen's University in Ireland, because options are not allowed to pass men before the third year. But who does not see from the above comparisons, that the classical course of Queen's University in Ireland is *vastly* above that of the Toronto University?

If we turn, *thirdly*,—not to the final, but to the intermediate examination (in the third year), at Oxford, the contrast is still more humiliating, as that includes the Four Gospels in Greek, six Books of Homer, or their equivalent in other Greek authors, and Horace's Odes, Epodes, and Ars Poetica, or their equivalent, instead of the little that is included as above, in the first two years of the Toronto University, apart from the corresponding difference in the character of the respective examinations.

Fourthly, Let us come to America, and omitting the examples of Yale and Columbia Colleges, I will confine myself to Harvard—the representative University of practical New England. The *first* and *second* year's classical course of studies in Harvard is as follows:—

First Year, *Greek*.—The Prometheus of Æschylus; Homer's Odessey, three books; The Panegericus of Isocrates; Felton's Greek Historians [Thucidides]; Lysias; Greek Antiquities; Exercise in writing Greek.—*Latin*.—Livy [Lincoln's selections]; Horace, Odes and Epodes; Cicero de Senectute and de Amicitia; Zumpt's Grammar; Ramsay's Elementary Manual of Roman Antiquities; Exercises in writing Latin.

Second Year, *Greek*—Demosthenes, both terms; Grote's History of Greece, vol. xi.; Exercises in writing Greek.—*Latin*, Cicero pro Sestio; Satires and Epistles of Horace, Beck's Syntax and Zumpt's Grammar; Exercises in writing Latin.

While the standard of matriculation in the Toronto University has been shown to be more than a year's studies below that of Harvard, how immensely does Toronto fall below Harvard in its first two years' classical course! Yet Harvard has a third year of still more severe classical studies than either of the two former, before it allows any option whatever between classics and any other department of study. Were I to institute the same inquiry in some other departments, the result would be still more humiliating. Take for instance modern languages, under which imposing cognomen is included French *or* German. In other Universities, where these languages are recognized as part of the University course, a matriculation examination is required in them as in Latin and Greek. Not so in the Toronto University college, which is a mere girl's school for French or German, where the students learn the sounds of the letters, and so on to the pronunciation of the words, the declensions of nouns, adjectives and pronouns, and the conjugations of the verbs. Yet a learned Professor is employed to teach, and honor University students are engaged in this profound a, b, c, of French and German, and even scholarships, prizes, and certificates of honor are instituted to reward the successful competitors! I happen to know that the examination questions in one of these "Modern Languages," given to the University scholarship candidates, were also given to a class of boys in a grammar school, and the boys quite distanced the undergraduates in their answering; yet the one was an ordinary grammar school exercise, and the other was an University scholarship examination; but the prize of the best gownsman in the scrub race was a thirty pounds scholarship and a convocation eulogy, while the reward of the still better boy was the approval of his master and a direction what to get for his next lesson. But for a *pass-man*, there is not so much as a single exercise of conversation in French or German in the whole University course which, it appears, does not advance so far in these modern languages as in an ordinary school for young ladies. Yet this is what Dr. Wilson boasts of as the study of "modern languages" in the University, and for which (the appropriate work of the school boy and of the Grammar School,) under graduates should leave their Latin and Greek, Mathematics and Metaphysics, since, as he says, "every educated man in this country, and especially every medical man, ought to know at least French

—which is here a spoken language—and German also." What masters of French and German will University graduates become by such a course of one or two lessons (I beg pardon, Lectures) a week! What an abuse of terms, what a misuse of an university student's time, what a peculation of the rightful work of the grammar school, and what a descent for the gownsman of the University from the classics and the sciences to the elementary studies of the school boy or school girl!

In review of the whole, then, how preposterous is Mr. Langton's assertion on the 38th page, "that in no sense is the study for our degree below that required in our best models!"

But I have now to examine some of Mr. Langton's specific statements and imputations on this point.*

In his notes on the 32nd page, he asserts, options "practically commence at the third year in the University of Toronto," and charges as "misrepresentation," what I had asserted in saying that options commenced the second year. Mr. Langton then quotes what he calls "the rule for the second year" as follows:

"A candidate for honors in any department who has obtained first class honors in the University, in his first year, either in Classics or Mathematics, or in both Modern Laguages and Natural Sciences, is not required in other departments to pass an examination in any branch in which he has already been examined in his first year; but having only been examined in pure Mathematics in his first year, he must also take applied Mathematics this year."

Now then the common sense reading of this rule is that any man who has obtained first class honors at the end of the first year can omit any branch whatever (except Mathematics,) in which he has passed his first year's examination! And I ask what is this but commencing options at the end of the first year, and not in the third year? But Mr. Langton attempts a forced and unnatural interpretation of the rule which the words themselves will not hear. He says:—

"Now the effect of this rule is, that a student who has taken first class honors in either Classics or Mathematics, need not take a second course

*Mr. Langton having stated at Quebec that I had employed two graduates of the British Universities, who had not succeeded as teachers (a statement which I corrected) attempts in a note on the 38th page, to make a little capital by saying, —"there was a third master selected by Dr. Ryerson, and found for some reasons inefficient, who was a graduate of Dublin." In this small matter Mr. Langton is as wide from from facts as I have shown him to be in some important matters. The gentleman alluded to was, I think, the third in the estimate of the Senate on the list of some twenty candidates for a mastership in Upper Canada College. An additional master was required in the Model Grammar School, and required immediately. That gentleman was unemployed. The Council of Public Instruction resolved to employ him from October to January, and advertise for a master. The gentleman consented to the temporary engagement, with the statement to him in writing that the mastership would be advertiesd. He performed his duties satifactorily; was a candidate; but an honour Oxford man and experienced teacher was preferred; yet I felt that the same "graduate of Dublin" was entitled to a strong letter of commendation, and he is now teaching one of the most important Grammar Schools in Upper Canada. It would have been for the interests of education if Mr. Langton and some others had made provision for the removal of incompetent instructors after a trial of six months, as I have invariably done.

of Modern Languages, or of Chemistry, or of Natural History, and several have availed themselves of the option. But with the essential subjects of Classics and Mathematics, the case is very different. Mathematics cannot be omitted the second year by any one, and Classics only in two cases: 1st, by a student who has taken first class honors in both Modern Languages and natural Sciences, a contingency which has never occurred yet; and 2nd, by a student who has taken first class honors in Mathematics."

Now, let the reader examine the rule again, and I submit to him whether Mr. Langton's interpretation is not at variance with it? I will suppose, (what takes place at every examination) that a student obtains first class honors in Mathematics, and only passes in other subjects and in Classics—that is answers one fourth of the questions asked on the only three classical subjects of the first year,—namely the sixth Book of the Iliad, sixth Book of the Aencid, and Cicero Amicitia—I ask whether he cannot omit not only his classics, but even all the other subjects except his Mathematics? Is not this, then, options before the third year—nay, at the end of the first year—and options to an extent unknown in any other College in the British dominions, and in very few colleges even in the Western States of America?

But this is not all; there is an unfairness in Mr. Langton's quotation which ought not to be expected from him. He has quoted the rule, not as it existed and was quoted at the investigation last April at Quebec, *but as it has since been amended.* (I understand a large business was done in the Senate in the way of amending regulations, and making new ones during the nine months after the Quebec investigation.) The rule as it was published in the Calendar (p. 11.) for 1859–1860, and quoted at Quebec is as follows: "Candidates for honors in any department, who have also in the first year obtained University first-class honors, either in Greek *or* Latin, *or* in Mathematics, or both Modern Languages and Natural Sciences, are not required to take any branch in which they have passed the University examination in the first year," &c., as above quoted. The *or* between Greek and Latin instead of "and" as given in the rule since the Quebec investigation, is material, and spoils to a still greater extent Mr. Langton's argument, as well as the fairness of his quotation. But I will go further, I will show that the case of options at the end of the first years is even stronger than I put it in my Defence at Quebec. The University Statute of 1857 on the subject goes farther than the interpretation of it given in the College Calendar for 1859–60 quoted by me. The *Statute* is as follows:

"A candidate for honors in any department, who has obtained honors in the Unversity, in his first year, is not required in other departments to pass an examination in any branch in which he has already been examined in his first year; but having only been examined in pure Mathematics in his first year, he must also take applied Mathematics this year."

There are three words in this clause of the statute which merit special notice. The first is the word "Honors"—not "*first class* honors," as in the present rule, but "Honors," of which there are two classes; and the names of these two classes of men of "honors" will be found to cover more than a page of the College Calendar, and include a great propor-

tion of the Students; yet every one of these numerous men of honors could range at will over the wide field of options The other two words of the statute, deserving notice,—namely, "department," and "branch,"—indicate the extent of those options. Now, in another part of this same statute on Studies, I find the studies of the first year divided into six "departments." 1. Greek and Latin Languages; 2. Mathematics; 3. Modern Languages; 4. History; 5. Natural Sciences; 6. Natural Theology and Evidences of Christianity. Two of these "departments" are divided into two "branches" each. Under modern languages are classed the two "branches" of English and French; and under Natural Sciences, are classed the two "branches" of Chemistry and Natural History. Now, any student who obtained "honors" (of either class) in any one of these six departments, and barely passed in the others, could abandon them all (except Mathematics) at the end of his first year, and exercise his choice,not only as to the six "departments," but even in regard to the four "branches" of two of the "departments!"

In my Quebec picture of the Toronto University options, I, therefore, fell quite below the reality, and my shading was dull and tame in comparison with the brilliancy of the original. The material change made in the statute since 1857, is placing the words "first-class" before the word honors."

Such are the options allowed during the *second* year of the University course—options peculiar to the Toronto University, and remarkable for labour-saving on all sides, and equally remarkable for erecting an educational structure of show, and without solidity or foundation. If we have not found a "royal road to learning," we have certainly got a Langton and Wilson road to "degrees made easy." Upper Canada wants what is solid and substantial, not, (as the late Sir James Stephen expressed it in the preface to his Cambridge Lectures on History,) "a shabby superficiality."

If we follow Mr. Langton and Dr. Wilson in their *third* and *fourth* year's University course, we will find their options a atural sequel to the "shabby superficiality" of their second year's course. In regard to the third year, we have the following rules:

"A student who is not a candidate for Honors, or who may not exercise the options permitted in honors, is not required at this examination to take both 'Greek and Latin' and the 'Modern Languages,' but either at his option." (That is, he can abandon Greek and Latin Literature to study the school boy elements of the French or German Grammar.)

"A candidate for honors in any *Department*, who has obtained first class Honors the second year, is not required to pass an examination in more than two *branches* [there are *three* 'branches' in one 'department'] in which he has already been examined in previous years, and he may select these *branches amongst* the *different departments*." (In this year there are *six* "departments," and three of them subdivided into seven "branches!")

Then if we proceed to the fourth year, which is for the *degree* examinations, we have the following regulations:

"A student who is not a candidate for Honors, or who may not exercise the options permitted in Honors, is not required at this

examination to take 'Greek and Latin,' and the 'Modern Languages,' but either department at his option.' Neither is a student required to take Metereology, Mathematics, and Chemistry, but any one of these subjects, at his option." [Thus a pass-man can pass his degree examination without being examined in either Greek, Latin, or Mathematics, and without having been examined in either of them during the preceding year. For the candidate for Honors the latitude of pick and choose is still wider, as the following regulation shows:]

"A candidate for Honors in any department who has attained first class Honors in the University in his third year, is not required to pass an examination in any other department than that in which he is a candidate for Honors."

I submit, therefore, whether my remarks at Quebec as to the nature and extent of options in the Toronto University are not more than borne out by an examination of the Regulations themselves.

I submit whether these Regulations do not refute the assertions of Mr. Langton and the appeals which he has made on the subject.

I submit finally, and what is most important—that in such a system of low matriculation requirement, and then of selecting and declining, gleaning and omitting, from the very end of the first year, and at length of emasculation and diminution, as you advance, whether there can be any solid University education, and whether degrees thus conferred can have any definite signification beyond the fact that the graduate has attended a certain period a kind of omnibus institution where a little of many things can be snatched up, but where there is no required thorough system of intellectual training in any thing.

I have, &c.,

March 27. E. RYERSON.

Letter IV.

(*Mr. Langton and Dr. Wilson compared—the latter objects to Dr. Ryerson's qualifications to advise in regard to a System of University Education.*)

Sir,—I now address myself for a short time to the 40 pages of this pamphlet which bear the name of Dr. Wilson,—a man quite inferior to Mr. Langton in mental acumen, though his superior in supercilious pretensions. Mr. Langton understands his subject, however narrow and partial his views; Dr. Wilson misunderstands his subject as well as his own position. Mr. Langton reasons; Dr. Wilson declaims. Mr. Langton accumulates plausible statistics; Dr. Wilson multiplies offensive insinuations. Mr. Langton abounds in artful sophistry; Dr. Wilson revels in spiteful invective. Mr. Langton's notes are so many desperate efforts to defend what is indefensible; Dr. Wilson's notes are so many ejections of feminality and venom. The essence of his *thrice-varied* speech and notes is embodied in one of his concluding remarks (to which I

made no reply) to the Committee. He said,—"On obtaining permission to address you," "I felt it my duty to show to the Committee that, neither by previous education, by special training or experience, nor by fidelity to the trust imposed in him as a member of the Senate of the University, does Dr. Ryerson merit the confidence of this Committee, or of the Province, as a fit adviser on a system of University education."

The confidence reposed by the Representatives of the people in Parliament in Dr. Wilson, the "unauthorized representative" of the UniversityCollege, after his speech and the reply to it,may be inferred from the fact that, they unanimously added £500 to the grant to Victoria College, which I had advocated, and which Dr. Wilson had assailed as having no claim to public support.

(*Examination by way of retort of Dr. Wilson's Qualifications, and how he obtained his Degree.*)

When Dr.Wilson urges and demands my disqualification in regard to the system of University education, he of course assumes to himself all the requisites to "merit the confidence of the Province as a fit adviser on a system of University Education." Though he deals as flippantly with the systems of the English Universities, as he does with Dr. Ryerson's history and qualifications, he yet confesses—"I have no great familiarity with the systems of Oxford and Cambridge. I was educated in Scottish halls." But it turned out in his cross examination before the Committee, that even in the "Scottish halls," he had never passed a degree or even a matriculation examination ; he took no degree—was no graduate—but an attendant on some courses of lectures in the "Scottish halls" of the Edinburgh University, as many persons are in the halls of Toronto University College, but who are not undergraduates. When he got the appointment of English Professor in University College, Toronto, he had no degree whatever, but got one as an outfit for "this Canada of ours" from the University of St. Andrews, (long noted for its lucrative trade in degrees,) and not from that of Edinburgh, where, as one Scottish gentleman of science and literature lately said, "Daniel Wilson was considered a very light horseman," and where, as another said (a native of Edinburgh and a scientific writer of reputation) Dr. Wilson could not have had the presumption to make the speech he did in Quebec. Dr. Wilson flourished in Edinburgh under the shadow of a truly learned and distinguished brother ; but he sets up in Toronto on his own account, first to extinguish and supplant Dr. McCaul, and then to annihilate Dr. Ryerson.

(*Dr. Wilson's suppression and variation of passages in his speech and additions.*)

Then this published speech itself is characteristic of its author—a piece of mere pretence. It is not the speech that was handed in to the Committee and printed in its Minutes; nor is it the speech that was delivered before the Committee : it is an emendation of both, got up and published a month after its professed delivery !

I can appeal to you, sir, as the Chairman of that Committee, and to all who heard me, that in not one instance did Dr. Wilson object to the accuracy of the passages which I quoted from his speech as I wrote them down at the time of delivery, and to which I replied. Yet in not one instance are those passages given in his published speech as he delivered them, as I quoted them, and as they are printed in my reply in the Minutes of the Committee ; and some of the passages quoted and replied to by me are omitted altogether in his published speech !

I can also appeal to you, sir, and all present on the occasion, that Dr. Wilson concluded his *spoken* speech, and resumed his seat in the midst of the laugh created by his allusion to my having meditated a system of public instruction for Canada on some of the highest mountains of Europe, which accounted, as he supposed, for its being so "very windy." These, as you, sir, and all present, well know, were the last words of Dr. Wilson's *spoken* speech ; yet, on turning to his printed speech in this pamphlet, you find the allusion not only differently expressed, but followed by *three pages* of the alleged conclusion of his speech,—a conclusion which was not delivered at all,—which, therefore, could not have been reported by anothor—but which has since been written out by himself, and is now published by him, and that out of the funds of the Universsity, as the veritable speech delivered by him before the Committee at Quebec !

The speech really delivered by him, I have sufficiently answered in my Reply made before the Committee, printed in its Minutes, and since published. Nor does this apocryphal version of his speech require any further remak.

How far, therefore, Dr. Wilson's career in the "Scottish halls," his speech at Quebec, or this new version of it,—or all together,—give him special claim to the confidence of "the Province as a fit adviser on a system of University education," may be left to you, sir, and to the public to judge.

(*Other illustrations of Dr. Wilson's qualifications to the exclusion of Dr. Ryerson in University matters.*)

But Dr. Wilson has furnished other samples of his rare qualifications as a "fit adviser" for Upper Canada in its "system of University education." The one is, his historical research in discovering that, "the age of Pericles, in which Greece lavished her resources upon stone and marble"—(as have the resources of the Toronto University been) was but the harbinger of her highest intellectual and moral grandeur, though Tytler says, "The age of Pericles is the period from which we may date the decline of Athens ;" and Rollin says,—"Plato, who formed a judgment of things, not from their outward splendour, but after truth, observes, (after his master, Socrates), that *Pericles, with all his grand edifices and other works, had not improved the mind of one of the citizens in virtue, but rather corrupted the purity and simplicity of their ancient manners.*" But as neither Plato nor his master, Socrates, was a graduate after Dr. Wilson's fashion, their authority must, of course, yield to his,

especially in his own department of History. Nor do I suppose he will have more respect for the opinion of EPICTETUS, who said—"You will confer the greatest benefit on your city, not by raising the roofs, but by exalting the souls of your fellow-citizens. For it is better that great souls should live in small habitations, than that abject slaves should burrow in great houses."—With research and accuracy equally characteristic, does Dr. Wilson assert the experience of Protestant countries to be against denominational colleges, although not a few school-boys know that England and America are dotted over with denominational colleges, and non-denominational ones are the exceptions, and are becoming comparatively fewer year by year.

But that which exceeds in originality and antiquity any of Dr. Wilson's other researches, is his discovery which he announced in a printed address to the Canadian Institute—namely, "the PEN of Socrates" and its marvellous effects. Plato and Xenophon have reported many of the sayings, and opinions, and doctrines of Socrates, which have also been satirized by the buffoonery of Aristophanes. But the "*pen* of Socrates" is quite a Wilsonian discovery, and must exalt its author far above *Sir Walter Scott's Scottish Antiquary*, and even render him scarcely second to the renowned MARTINUS SCRIBLERUS himself, who found an ancient shield, encrusted with venerable dust, and mused profoundly upon what must have been the splendid appearance of its bright newness, when, one day an officious house-maid scoured off the rust, and found it to be an old pot-lid! It is to be hoped a like fate may not befall Dr. Wilson's "Pen of Socrates," but that he will place this remarkable "relic" in the University College Museum, with his collection of Indian pipes and tobacco, for the inspection of the curious.

So much, then, by way of pleasantry and retort, in regard to Dr. Wilson's qualifications, "as a fit adviser on a system of University education," to the exclusion of Dr. Ryerson, and all other Canadians who are not "graduates," after the example and pretensions of this professorial sciolist who insults them.

(Dr. Wilson's charge arising out of Proposed Grammar School Master Exhibitions refuted.)

I will now notice some of Dr. Wilson's statements in his notes. In his note on page 53, he endeavours to convict me of gross inconsistency because I condemn the low standard of matriculation into the University, while I proposed in March, 1857, four exhibitions for Common School Teachers in the University, with a view of their appointment to the masterships of Grammar Schools after one year's study in the University, commencing with matriculation. The conditions of those proposed exhibitions were four, as quoted by Dr. Wilson himself: "1. The Exhibitioner must have taught a common school in Upper Canada. 2. He must have attended the Provincial Normal School at least one session. 3. He must have been recommended by the Council of Public Instruction. 4. He must engage to teach a grammer School in Upper Canada for at least three or four years; and provide for the fulfilment of this promise, or refund the

amount of his Exhibition with interest." In my letter to the Senate proposing those Exhibitions, I remarked, (as quoted by Dr. Wilson, also) "In our present Normal and Model Schools, and in our proposed *Grammar School*, the Exhibitioners would receive *a thorough preparatory training*, both as students and teachers, *in all the subjects in which candidates are examined for matriculation into the University*." Now, Dr. Wilson omits one fact, but a fact which destroys his whole argument, if its omission does not prove his disingenuousness. It is the fact, that the standard of matriculation at that time was not what it is now, but as it was established in 1854,—a standard which Dr. Wilson says in his speech was higher than that at which degrees are conferred in the Scottish Universities. It is also worthy of remark, that the Model Grammar School thoroughly trains its pupils in all the subjects required by law to be taught in the Grammar Schools. A student, therefore, thus prepared, (and especially in the case of a young man who had served a successful apprenticeship as a Common School teacher, and had then been trained in the Normal and Model Grammar Schools,) and entering the University at the former standard of matriculation, would have been much further advanced at the end of one year, than an undergaduate now is at the end of two years, when both classics and mathematics become optional studies. Of the propriety of such a proposition, under such circumstances, and of its advantages both to the ablest Common School teachers and to the Grammar Schools, every intelligent and practical man can judge. But as the standard of matriculation is now reduced, such exhibitions would be of little use beyond the training given in the Normal and Model Grammar Schools, as candidates for Grammar School Masterships having certificates as second year's men in the University, have been *plucked* for incompetency by the Committee of Examiners.

(*Dr. Wilson's statements and proceedings as to evidence arising out of the reports of Grammar School Inspectors refuted and exposed.*)

I next advert to a statement of Dr. Wilson on page 81, more disreputable than any I have yet noticed; and I think, sir, the perusal of it can hardly fail to excite indignation in your own mind, and in that of the Hon. Mr. Foley, and of such other members of the late University Committee as were present when the circumstances referred to transpired. It relates to what I alleged as to the comparative efficiency, upon the whole, of graduates of the different Colleges as Masters of Grammar Schools, *as gathered from the reports of the Inspectors.* The scandalous proceeding of Dr. Wilson in this matter cannot be understood without a brief reference to the circumstances of the case. You will recollect, sir, that on my first appearance before the Committee, in obedience to your summons, I made a verbal statement, which I was requested to prepare and hand in in writing. I did so, but with some delay in consequence of bereavement and affliction. But I wrote it out at intervals as I could, sending to the printer a few pages at a time, and mostly without even reading after writing them. You left Quebec a few days before the adjournment of the House for the Easter holidays, and the Hon. Mr. Foley acted in your place as Chairman of the Committee.

During the last sitting of the Committee, before the Easter holidays, several copies of my evidence, printed in slips, were brought into the com-

mittee room. On glancing down these slips, I observed it was a proof of my evidence, which had never been sent me, which I had not corrected, and in which parts of my statement were misplaced, words omitted in some places, and wrong words set up in others. I immediately addressed publicly the Chairman of the Committee, (Mr. Foley,) stating that copies of my evidence had been sent in slips, without the proof having been corrected or seen by me—that parts of the evidence had been misplaced, and many words of the manuscript had been mistaken by the printer. The Chairman forthwith gave directions that I should be allowed to correct and revise the proof at my discretion, and that my statement should not be sent out until corrected by me. Yet some copies of these uncorrected and unrevised proofs were sent out, and parts of them published in some of the papers. After the adjournment of the Committee, the Hon. Mr. Cayley (who was reading a proof copy of my statement) drew my attention to certain expressions which he thought might cause pain to some individuals, and suggested whether it would not be better to omit them. I acceded to his suggestions, so far as to omit one or two expressions, and modify others. I forthwith corrected and revised the proof, and got a number of copies printed in slips at my own expense, and addressed them to several parties. Thus matters remained until the Committee re-assembled after the holidays, when you were present and presided. In the course of the proceedings, Mr. Langton intimated that he did not desire now to summon the Inspectors of Grammar Schools, as Dr. Ryerson had withdrawn the imputations which he wished to rebut. I then appealed to the Committee that I had withdrawn nothing, as no authentic statement of my evidence had been given, except that before the Committee, and recapitulating, as above stated, what had transpired in the Committee during its last sitting before the Holidays, and what were the directions of the Chairman of the Committee. Mr. Langton denied the accuracy of my statement, and Dr. Wilson rose to support Mr. Langton, when some conversation took place between some members of the Committee (including Mr. Foley, Mr. Roblin, and, I think, Mr. Simpson, of Niagara), and you, in a clear, strong voice, said—"Mr. Langton, three members of the Committee, who were present, understand the matter just as Dr. Ryerson states it."

You will recollect, Sir, that I re-affirmed the statements as contained in the first printed proof of my report in the points objected to—that the *reports* themselves were there from which I had received my impressions and drawn my inferences—that I knew not what the Inspectors thought or intended—that I appealed to the *reports*, that I was ready to go over them with any one or more members of the Committee, and let them say whether I was justified in my inferences and statements, which Mr. Langton (to whom I had lent the reports,) denied. You will doubtless recollect, likewise, that in reference to my proposal or challenge to examine the reports themselves with any members of the Committee, Mr. Attorney General Macdonald remarked, "that is fair." Yet after these occurrences, and in presence of these facts, Dr. Wilson, on page 81, endeavors to impugn me on this subject, and charges me with an "extraordinary and unfounded statement," which "was forthwith investigated, and the inspectors of Grammar Schools called upon to state what were

the facts of the case." The absurdity, as well as groundlessness of this statement is manifest from the fact, that the question had nothing to do with the *Inspectors*, but with what was contained in their *reports*, which were laid before the Committee.*

Finally, to complete the catalogue of inconsistencies, Dr. Wilson quotes from a letter of mine published in June, 1828, on "The University," in which I objected to the first charter of King's College, as being for one church alone. In the passages which Dr. Wilson quotes, I referred to the persecuting bigotry of Oxford University in having expelled John Locke and John Wesley from its halls, and objected to an University being established by the State in Upper Canada on the same principles. Dr. Wilson thinks he has discovered "a marvellous change in my sentiments" since then as to denominational or non-denominational Colleges..

It is rather hard for a man to be hounded over a period of thirty-three years—from the age of 25 to that of 57, in search of an inconsistency in his sentiments on a great social question in a young country whose institutions are undergoing frequent and rapid changes. It is possible that it was in this search for a "relic" of my inconsistency, Dr. Wilson discovered the more remarkable "relic" of the "pen of Socrates." However that may be, his research seems to have been as superficial and one-sided in regard to the sentiments of my youthful letter of 1828, as I have shown him to be on other subjects with which he ought to be acquainted. I might claim to be more competent to judge on this as well as on other subjects now than I was 33 years ago. But I am willing to have my consistency tried by so severe a test, as it happens that my first impressions on this subject are my present views. With his usual unfairness, Dr. Wilson omits to state what were the defined objects of King's

* The following are the remarks which I made on this subject a few days after, in my general defence before the Committee, in reply to Mr. Langton and Dr. Wilson:

"Then, Sir, Dr. Wilson impugns another statement of mine, not on his own authority, but on that of Mr. Langton, in whom he says he has full confidence, as to the comparative efficiency as teachers of Grammar Schools of the graduates of University College, and those of other Colleges. And he presented a formal indictment against me to the Attorney-General for Upper Canada, drawing his attention, as an adviser to the Crown, to what I had said. The intention of the appeal was manifest. It was with a view to my dismissal from office. Sir, if my official position depended upon the course I have taken in this question, I should take the course I now take, and cast office and its emoluments to the winds, sooner than abandon the rights and interests of a people with whom I have been associated from my youth. But, Sir, I think the Ministers of the Crown are not such men as the gentleman imagines. Nevertheless, I take my stand, and I will bear the consequences. If my office depends on the course I pursue this day, let it go, and let me betake myself to the kind of labor in which the sympathies of my heart, especially at my period of life, are most deeply enlisted. He tells you my statement must be incorrect, and quotes what he says is an expression of the Rev. Mr. Ormiston's. Sir, I should require better testimony than that, to believe that Mr. Ormiston would say anything to my disparagement. I *refer to the reports* of the inspectors, which give their opinions, and *these, as the members of the Committee may see*, bear out the truth of my remarks. I doubt whether Mr. Ormiston used the expression attributed to him—here is his Report, and the Report of Mr. Cockburn, too, both speaking for themselves."

College projected in 1828, of the provisions of its charter, and of the grounds of objection to it. Addressing the then Archdeacon of York, (Dr. Strachan) who had procured the Royal Charter, and referring to the contemplated University, I said—"All its officers and professors are required to be of the Church of England—it is entirely under the direction and control of that Church—and you yourself said in your appeal to the men of literature and religion in England, that 'it would be essentially a Missionary College for the education of Missionaries of the Church of of England;' and, as an argument to obtain from the members of that church contributions towards the funds of the College, you mentioned that 'the effect of establishing it will be ultimately to make the greater portion of the population of the Province members of the Church of England.'"—It may appear strange at this day, even to many members of the Church of England, that such were the publicly and sincerely avowed objects of the only endowed University of Upper Canada in 1828; and it will perhaps be thought equally strange that at that time Wesleyans and others could not only not be married by their own Clergy, but had no law by which to hold a piece of ground on which to erect a place of worship, or in which to bury their dead. Nor may it be improper for me to remark, that my own advocacy then (and for two years previously) of equal civil rights for all classes, and on the University question, (from which Dr. Wilson urges my proscription on the ground of ignorance and unfaithfulness) was the result of deputations to me from Ministers of different religious persuasions, (who furnished me with many valuable books then scarce in the country) some of whom were graduates of British Universities, who had obtained their titles on the ground of right, after having passed both matriculation and degree examinations, and not by begging or purchase. But even in 1828, the objection against the University charter, was not upon the ground of non-denominational Colleges, as against denominational Colleges, but upon the ground of a one Church College monopoly against all other Churches, just as we now contend against a no-Church College monopoly against the Colleges of all Churches. Thus in the very letter of 1828, from which Dr. Wilson quotes, I concluded one part of my argument in the following words:

"Hence His Majesty's grant of the present Charter, which was intended to 'conduce to the welfare of the Province,' being nothing but an apple of discord, *a source of unjust* MONOPOLY *on one hand, and of barbarous exclusion on the other,* ought to be EXTENDED *or withdrawn altogether.*"

Then as the School System of Scotland had been adduced as an argument to support the system of a one-Church-College, I gave a brief account of that system from the *Edinburgh Christian Instructer* and from the *Edinburgh Review*, and remarked as follows:

"Such is the System of Education to which Scotland owes its high reputation for intellectual improvement, and such is the System of Education we would advocate for Canada—a system established by Acts of our Provincial Legislature—a system on an economical plan—a system conformable to the wishes of the great mass of the population—a system promoted by the *united* efforts of the *laity* and *Clergy of every denomination.*"

I submit, therefore, that tried even by the extraordinary ordeal of what

I wrote in 1828, the School System I then sketched is now a reality, and the University System I then hinted at is now the desideratum.*

But Dr. Wilson seems not to understand how I can honour the scholarship and literature of Oxford now, when in 1828 I denounced its bigotry and exclusiveness. He does not appear to comprehend the difference between bigotry and literature; and that even in respect to exclusiveness itself, Oxford, since the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, and since the repeal of its own tests by Act of Parliament in 1854, is, I scarcely need say, not the Oxford it was in the days of John Locke and John Wesley. But even in 1828, while I denounced the bigotry of Oxford, I paid homage to its literature in stronger terms than I did at Quebec last year, and in the following words:

"The University of Oxford, which has existed (as Cowper says) 'time out of mind,' and that of Cambridge, also venerable for its antiquity, have thrown a literary splendour around Great Britain, which very justly gives her the pre-eminence over most of the European nations, and have produced many of the brightest lights that ever graced any age or nation."

The next topic to which I will refer, is one on which Dr. Wilson seems to be specially restive—namely, the slight value I seem to place on his professorship in University College; and Mr. Langton, in a note on page 13, thinks me very inconsistent to incline to dispense with Dr. Wilson's Professorship in the College, after having recommended in my letter to Mr. Hincks in 1852, a professorship of the same kind *in a Provincial University*. In my defence of the Petitioners at Quebec, I gave my reasons for thinking that Dr. Wilson's professorship, from its topics and connexions, belongs to the Grammar School, rather than the College, and what is the true method of teaching the English language and English literature itself in the course of College studies; while in my letter to Mr. Hincks, I suggested professorships and lectures that should be *supplementary* to and *above* those of the College. In my letter I said—

"I would propose further to maintain and to give effect to the idea

* I may observe that in 1832, Victoria College, then Upper Canada Academy, was projected; that in 1836–7 a Royal Charter with a public grant in its aid was obtained; that in 1840 (two years before Toronto University was opened) it was incorporated as the University of Victoria College with a grant of £500 per annum; that in 1846, when I presented my first report on a system of public elementary instruction in Upper Canada, I regarded denominational Colleges as an integral part of the system; that in 1849, I officially announced my determination to retire from office sooner than assent to a law that would exclude the Bible as a right of Protestants from the Schools, or that ignored the right of parents and pastors in regard to the Schools and the religious instruction of youth; that in 1852 I explained and urged at large in a letter to Mr. Hincks, the duty, right, and patriotism of recognizing and aiding denominational Colleges as an essential part of our educational system, and that that was the very time I was defending that system against the aggressions of a Roman Catholic Bishop; that in my official school report for 1854, while I vindicated at large our school system, I pointed out denominational *seminaries and colleges* as the harmonious and natural sequel to it. Thus, for more than thirty years I have held and advocated a denominational college system as the proper supplement to and counterpart of, a non-denominational common school system; and the church to which I belong, and of which I have often been the agent and representative in these matters, is known to have held and supported, as it still holds and supports, the same views.

which has been vaguely, though popularly, held, namely, the idea of a *Provincial University*, sustaining a *common* relation to *all the Colleges* of the country, and *providing instruction* in *subjects and branches of science and literature which do not come within the undergraduate curriculum of any College.*" "I would connect with this University such professorships as those of Ancient and Modern Philosophy and Literature, General History, Natural History, Astronomy, Political Economy, Civil Engineering, Agriculture, &c. I would make the Library and Lectures free to the Professors, Graduates and Undergraduates of all the incorporated Colleges, and perhaps to the members and students of the professions generally, according to prescribed regulations. I would have the lectures easily accessible if not free to the public."

I might very properly recommend such professorships and lectures (and they could have been effectively provided for had not the University Endowment been so reduced by wasteful expenditure), and yet regard as rather injurious than otherwise such lectures as Dr. Wilson's, to youth from 14 to 20 years, admitted at a low standard, and in the midst of the severe and confessedly essential studies of a sound collegiate curriculum. Dr. Wilson may think that information talked into pupils is the true way to make full men of them; he may regard the young men in "this Canada of ours" as a species of the animals described by PLINY, that fatten upon smoke, and think that his smoke is the best of food for that purpose; but I rather agree with the late Dr. ARNOLD—the prince of instructors and scholars,—when he said, "I care less and less for information, more and more for the true exercise of the mind; for answering questions concisely and comprehensively, for showing a command of language, a delicacy of taste, and a comprehensiveness of thought, and a power of combination." SIR JAMES STEPHEN, late Professor of History at Cambridge, said,—"I am extremely sceptical as to the real value of *public oral teaching* on such a subject as mine [Modern History]. If Abelard were living now, I believe he would address his instructions, not to the *ears* of thousands crowding round his chair, but to the *eyes* of myriads *reading* them in studious seclusion."

Lectures on history and cognate subjects, which are a time-losing and an attention-distracting farce for college boys, may be of great value to men who have completed, or are far adanced in, the mental training of a solid college curriculum, as even conveying useful information, but especially as suggestive of the various sources of knowledge and the manner of acquiring it. But Dr. Wilson's views seem not to reach an inch beyond the little horizon of his own petty prelections, or above the low standard of his disjointed and attenuated college curriculum. Nay, he looks with amazement to the height of the former standard of matriculation, as "a higher requirement than a man can take his degree in any University in Scotland,"* though the standard of matriculation in the

* In his *published* speech Dr. Wilson has added, "in Oxford or Cambridge or in the London University;" but he did not go beyond Scotland in his speech as delivered. The addition has doubtless been made in consequence of my reply, that by Dr. Wilson's own confession, he had never advanced so far as the former standard of matriculation at Toronto. His reference to the English Universities is simply absurd.

Queen's Colleges in Ireland, in Harvard and Yale, is still higher, and higher still in the English Universities. Young men enter the English Universities at the average age from 18 to 20 (after a thorough school training up to that period); but in the Toronto University, boys can enter at the age of 14, and may come out full blown graduates at the age of from 18 to 20, after an unprecedented system of pick and choose in their studies from the end of the first year,—that is from the age of 15 or 16. It is impossible but the educated mind of Canada must be belittled as well as inflated by such a system of "shabby superficiality," and money misapplied in its support.

I doubt not but many worthy and able young men are among the undergraduates and graduates of this system; I trust some of them will become ornaments and benefactors of their country; but it will be not in consequence but in spite of the system itself; by their own strong sense and manly energies, they will lay deep and broad foundations, and raise an intellectual superstructure of magnificence and grandeur beyond anything embraced in this feeble college system. They will owe their distinctions to themselves, under the Divine blessing, and derive no prestige from "degrees made easy" under the low matriculation and endlessly optional scheme of Mr. Langton and Dr. Wilson.

I have, &c.,

E. RYERSON.

March 29.

P.S.—The policy of Mr. Langton and Dr. Wilson having been to raise as much dust as possible by personal attacks upon me, so as to divert attention from the real merits of the question, I have felt it necessary to occupy a considerable part of this and the preceding letters in replying —I hope for the last time—to those attacks. As personal impuations and insinuations against me were, for a transparent purpose, used for arguments, it would have been alleged that I had not answered their arguments, had I not replied to what was substituted for arguments. But while repelling and retorting personal attacks, I trust I have not failed to develop throughout the great principles of the question, and to exhibit the unjust and downward course of the managers and advocates of a one college monopoly. I may remark that I have abstained from noticing again two or three of Dr. Wilson's impugning statements involving the names of third parties, who have no connection with the present discussion, though to have noticed these statements would have furnished additional illustrations of his garbling as to facts and quotations.*

---

* *It may, however, be proper to give the following replies from the Rev. W. H. Poole to certain Notes in the Langton–Wilson University Pamphlet.*

1. To the notes on pages 14 and 89, impugning the correctness of the Rev. W. H. Poole's list of 45 salaried officers, that gentleman replies as follows:—

"If I had so far done injustice to the official returns of the Bursar of the University, as Messrs. Langton and Wilson pretend to affirm, it is remarkable that neither of these gentlemen, nor the Bursar himself, dared to question the accuracy of my evidence when I was before the Committee, and when I could have shown the truth of my remarks from the documents on the table. My statement was made on the authority of the *financial report of the Bursar of the University*. There are *forty-five* separate salaries given in the Bursar's report;

Dr. Wilson, in his objections to Victoria College, allows no credit for the fact that, by its Charter, the Speakers of both Houses of Parliament, and two members of the Executive are ex-officio members of the Senate, because they do not attend its meetings. Were anything objectionable introduced into the College—any sectarian tests or exclusiveness—they would doubtless attend and see the wrong rectified. They have the *right* to attend, and to inquire at all times in all things pertaining to the College. But, on the other hand, in every report and in other official papers of the Toronto University, the names of the Provost of Trinity College, the Principals of Queen's, Regiopolis, and Bytown Colleges, and of

---

and if some of the recipients were pluralists, the remarkable case of Mr. Pluralist Langton had not then been sufficiently brought to light to put me on my guard against confounding the item of single salaries with single individuals. It is probably not generally known that this gentleman combined in his single person (with separate salaries or allowances) the office (1) of Auditor of Public Accounts for the Province of Canada; (2) Commissioner (in the matter of the Reciprocity Treaty) to the Eastern Provinces; (3) Vice Chancellor of the University of Toronto; (4) Co. Inspector of Prisons and Jails in Upper and Lower Canada; and (5) Joint Commissioner to inquire into the affairs of the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada. How many more offices this official monopolist fills does not yet appear. In the list of 45 separate salaries given in the Bursar's report, the only one I was in any doubt about was that of the Chairman of the Board of Endowment, who received $400 salary for attending *one meeting*; that chairman being the Bursar himself with a salary of $1,840. I have now in hand the memorandum I made in the Committee room on which I based that clause of my evidence; and I believe that if I had now the returns before me, as I then had, I could give the names of all the parties. My memorandum contains the following names: Buchan, $1,840; Cameron, $1,840; Drummond, $1,440; Nation, $1,000; Smith, $750; Morrow, $400; Langton, $800; Lorimer, $1,200; Morris, $750; ——, $160; Newton, $199; then the eleven Professors and the Tutor; after them, Orris, $500; Coady, $425; Patterson, $425; Drew, $425; King, $425; Nelson, $340; Millar, $349; Kewon, $349; then follows the house-keeper, gate-keeper, bell-ringer, &c. I need not enlarge the list of names, as they are all in the report, with a salary attached to each.

"2. In Mr. Langton's note on page 18, he denies having charged Dr. Ryerson with the extravagance of which we complained, especially on the scholarship question. I have not the *Globe* in which it appeared; but I am quite sure it did appear in that newspaper; and my notes show that Dr. Wilson in his vehement personal attack on Dr. R. repeated it over and over again. He may venture to deny it now, as the varied editions of his speech differ from each other in many things, and all from his speech as it was delivered before the Committee. He may well be ashamed of himself in this matter.

"3. In Mr. Langton's note on page 24 he tasks, "Is here no error in calling the expenses of Victoria College $1,600 less than Dr. Green says the salaries amount to." My statement was taken from the official report, printed by order of the House of Assembly. I gave the salaries at Victoria College as they were reported that year; thus gleaning my figures in reference to our own College from the same source from which I took the others, There is also the important fact (conveniently omitted by Mr. Langton, but stated in my answer to question 199) that I gave the Victoria College salaries as officially reported; but Dr. Green gave them *after another professor and another tutor had been added to the staff of Victoria College.* In this the monopolists misrepresent me; and they do so knowing that I was right, as I took my figures from the same year's official returns of all the Colleges. If I had been wrong on any of these points, they would most gladly have exposed me before the Committee."

others, are published as members of the Senate, although they never attend, and some of them have given notice that they would not attend.

Mr. Langton also states, that "one reason why Denominational Colleges have not adopted the University course has been stated to be that they are unable, from insufficient means, to teach all the subjects required." I believe this statement to be wholly unfounded. I never heard of it except from the *pen* of Mr. Langton, for it was never uttered, at least in my hearing. The course of studies *required* in the Denominational Colleges is more thorough than that *required* in the Toronto University; but they do not allow their students to pick and choose their subjects, but to take all the subjects of the course. I believe the reasons assigned that undergraduates in Denominational Colleges would not compete for *honors* and scholarships in the Toronto University were, that they would not be allowed, apart from the question of examiners, to leave all other subjects of their course, to study one or two; nor were the Denominational Colleges able, or disposed if they were able, to employ extra professors, or employ the time of ordinary professors, to teach students in subjects not embraced in the course taught to and studied by all.

Letter V.

(Facts and references—Testimony to Professors in University College—Dr. McCaul—Dr. Wilson's imputation upon distinguished persons and three Senates, in a note.)

Sir,—I will now address myself to the principal facts and vital principles of this great University question. I have thought it needless, in the preceding letters, to dwell again upon the vast and extravagant expenditures of the University Endowment, reducing its income in a sum sufficient (allowing even $100,000 for the erection of College buildings, had the Statute authorized it) to support two efficient Colleges. The great facts on that subject have not been questioned; and the Hon. Alex. Campbell, of Kingston, in a late published speech, has exceeded all previous disclosures as to Toronto University expenditures. It has been shown that Mr. Baldwin's Government, in 1850, proposed £20,000 for the erection of University buildings, which were to provide for the Faculties of Law and Medicine, as well as of Arts, and as the sole College of the country. It has also been shown that Her Majesty's Government, here erected three splendid University Colleges in Ireland, with accommodations in each for the Faculties of Law, Medicine, and Arts, and residences of President and Vice President, and at much less than half the sum for each College than has been expended on the University buildings at Toronto, without residences, and where there is only the Faculty of Arts. Nothing more, therefore, need be added on the subject. Nor have I deemed it needful to re-discuss at length the question of *scholarships*, as my previous arguments and facts have not been answered, and the scholarships are only one of the outcrops of what lies deeply embedded in the system itself. Neither have I again referred to the University College composition of the Senate, as no attempt to question the Rev. Mr. Poole's conclu-

sive evidence on the subject has been made. Nor, finally, have I referred to the *honor* or *voluntary studies* and examinations in University College, as distinguished from the pass studies and examinations, as these do not relate to what is *required*. Had I compared the honor studies and examinations at Toronto with those of the English Universities, the difference and contrast would have been more remarkable than those that have appeared in comparing and contrasting the pass or required studies and examinations at Toronto and in the English and other Universities. In addition to which nearly one half of the time of the publicly-paid Professors in Toronto University College is employed in lectures, not in the pass or required subjects, but in the voluntary subjects of candidates for honours and scholarships; whereas all such Candidates in every English or American College provide whatever instruction they need or desire in subjects for which they expect to be rewarded by honors, prizes and scholarships. This is the more exceptional still in regard to both professors and students, when the candidates for honors and scholarships in the Toronto University College are allowed to omit many of the pass subjects, whereas in the English Colleges, the honor subjects and examinations are in *addition* to what is required in the pass subjects and at pass examinations. The honor and scholarship men there, are those who do all the work of pass men and a very great deal more, and at their own expense; the men of honor and scholarsh[illegible]re are those who pick and choose certain subjects; —omitting others—and devote the chief part, if not the whole, of their time to these selected subjects, with the aid of professors whose whole time is paid for by the public, and which ought to be devoted to the public or required work of the College for the benefit of all students performing that work.

It now remains to enquire whether the Toronto University College has any good grounds to be regarded as the solely endowed institution of University education for Upper Canada; and, if not, what the national system of University education should be.

Let it be here observed, that in discussing the course of studies in the Toronto University College, I have not intended in the preceding letters, nor do I now intend, any disrespect to its professors, to whose attainments and abilities I have more than once borne my humble testimony. The fact of Dr. Wilson not being a graduate of any University, and of his acquirements being so superficial, cannot materially detract from the efficiency of the Faculty as a whole, especially as his prelections are an excrescence, rather than an essential part of the curriculum, and he must be well up by this time in Craik's Elements and Spaulding's Compendium, as also tolerably versed in Latham. Dr. McCaul's reputation as an accomplished scholar and able instructor has been long established. The curriculum established in old King's College, of which he was President, and the curriculum established in Toronto University in 1851 and 1854,* when he was Vice-Chancellor, and prepared by him, express his

* Dr. Wilson, in his speech at Quebec, says, "I hold in my hand the original matriculation examination of the *Toronto University*, inherited from the old King's College, which I do not hesitate to say, if persisted in by us, would have been the most *solemn farce* educated men ever attempted to perpetrate in any country." He insinuates that it must have been a deceptive "paper programme." Now, the author of that programme, which Dr. Wilson charac-

views of what an University education for Canada ought to be. Though I have never exchanged a word with him on the subject, I am sure he must naturally feel pained at the gothic invasion of his own department, and the depredations which have been committed in it; but he knows that in past years he has annually sent out graduates worthy of the name, and that no one will attribute to him the late reductions and emasculations of the University curriculum. It is to be hoped he may yet be able to restore it to an elevation, solidity, and comprehensiveness worthy of a National University Institution.

(*Why the defects of University College have been noticed.*)

Nor should I have felt it my duty to notice any defects in the system of Toronto University College more than in any other College in the country, were it not the only state endowed College of the country, and advocated as the only College worthy of such endowment. The gauntlet was therefore thrown down to the advocates of the equal rights of other Colleges. I was resolved to volunteer no expression of opinion before the Committee; but that if called upon by the Committee I would take up the gauntlet which monopoly had thus thrown down, and test the claims of Toronto University College to be the only publicly endowed University College of Upper Canada. This is now the essence of the University question. I remark then that Toronto University College has no right to be the only endowed College of the country for the following reasons:

(*First reason why University College should not be the only endowed College of the Country—it is not acceptable to large portions of the Inhabitants.*)

1. It is not acceptable to large sections of the inhabitants. The existence of Colleges in connexion with four of the largest religious denominations in the country,—and these colleges established by voluntary effort—proves how large a proportion of the people of Upper Canada dissent from

terises as a "solemn farce," and insinuates was deceptive, or designed as a means of erecting a cruel monopoly, &c., was the Bishop of Toronto, (now so venerable for years, labours, and virtues,) aided by Dr. McCaul, and one member of each of the English Universities, and by the counsel of such men as Sir John Robinson, &c. However many may differ from the Bishop of Toronto in some points of religious doctrine and polity, all know that he is one of the most experienced, practical, and earnest educationists that Canada ever knew. He had been a Canadian Grammar School teacher himself many years; he thoroughly knew the country; he was the last man for educational "farces" or "paper programmes," as were those associated with him. For Dr. Wilson to charge such men (including the Senates of the University in 1851 and 1854) with adopting an University programme higher than that of the English Universities, simply betrays his own ignorance; and for him to impugn such men as the perpetrators of shams and farces in the curriculum of a Collegiate education, is something more than "a solemn farce," which I leave the reader to characterize. His own familiarity with educational "farces" and "paper programmes" may have suggested to him the imputation on the three successive Senates of the University, and on men "whose shoe latchets he is unworthy to unloose," whether they are regarded as scholars and educationists, or as long residents and benefactors of the country. For such men as Dr. Wilson and Mr. Langton to impugn the venerable Bishop of Toronto, Chief Justice Robinson, Dr McCaul, and three successive Senates of the Provincial University as empirics and authors of "a solemn farce" in a system of University education, is the very climax of assurance and absurdity."

a College under no religious faith or oversight, and prefer Colleges of their own religious faith, heart and practice. The only perceptible difference among the members of any of these great sections of the community, is in the Church of England; but that difference is owing to local and I trust temporary causes, and not to a difference on the question of a Church of England College itself. I believe there is scarcely a member of that Church in Canada who would not rather have his son educated in a Church of England College than in a non-denominational one; but many members of the Church of England think there is a kind of religious teaching in Trinity College, Toronto, not consistent with the evangelical Protestant faith of that Church, and worse than no religious teaching. But were that objection removed, the heart of the Church of England throughout the land would be one with Trinity College, and fill its halls; and were the religious test to students abolished—now abolished in Oxford itself—not a few would resort to Trinity College from other religious persuasions, from the excellence of its classical and mathematical teaching, and its courses in mental and natural science, preferring sound religious instruction and oversight, though not of their own persuasion, to exposing their sons in such a city as Toronto in attending an institution of no such guardianship and influence. Even the section of the Presbyterians who more generally support the monopoly of Toronto University College, do so from denominational convenience—supplying, it appears, a large proportion of its students, caring for them in their own Theological College, and using University College as the literary school for their Divinity students. But the traditional history and practice of all branches of the Presbyterian Church * in other countries, is to establish Colleges for themselves, and conduct the collegiate education of their youth under their own oversight. They will ultimately find that to be for the best religious and intellectual interests of their educated young men in Canada, though pecuniary considerations may influence them at present to adopt an exceptional course.

Now, no College can be considered alone national and alone entitled to a nation's liberality, when such large portions of the people not only do not confide in it, but erect Colleges of their own in preference. If a Church of the minority of the people exclusively endowed by the State, is a wrong and an outrage upon the excluded classes, is a College of the minority to the exclusion of the Colleges of the majority, a less wrong and outrage upon the excluded classes? If the members of a Church ought not to be deprived of the equal protection and favours of the State because of dissenting from another Church, ought their College to be ignored and proscribed because it dissents from a College of no Church? All govern-

* I am aware of a partial exception in the case of the Free Church in Scotland, in availing themselves of the Edinburgh University for the literary education of their students, and giving them religious and theological instruction in their own Theological College in Edinburgh. But that is also, as at Toronto, a matter of convenience and economy, and especially as there is no such difference between the Free and Established Church of Scotland as would prevent their uniting in the same University College. But in England neither the Presbyterians of Free Church nor Kirk adopt the non-denominational University College of London, but have one of their own affiliated to the London University.

mental or legislative wrong to any portion of the people, however small, embodies the elements of weakness and decay, as well as of injustice. The excluded classes will gather strength as they dispel the mists of error and prejudice; a sense of common wrong will combine them more and more in a common cause—as was the case in former years against the Clergy Reserve monopoly—until they prostrate a Toronto College monopoly as they have done a Clergy Reserve monopoly in the dust, either by placing all Colleges doing the same work upon equal footing in regard to the University endowment, or by sweeping it away altogether for the improvement of the Grammar Schools, and leaving equally all parties who want University education to provide it for themselves, as they do so largely in the neighbouring States. The principle of equal rights among all Colleges, as among all Churches, must prevail, either by all or none receiving public aid. Both branches of the Legislature of Upper Canada once passed an Act (after securing certain individual rights) to divide the Clergy Reserves among all religious persuasions according to a census to be taken once in five years, and leaving each persuasion to apply its share to educational purposes, if it desired not to apply it to other purposes; but those who claimed exclusive right to the Reserves got the Canadian Act disallowed, and an Imperial Act passed in place of it. But the inevitable result of equality came at last, though delayed fifteen years longer, and the exclusive claimants lost all that did not appertain to individual incumbents. The advocates of the Toronto College monopoly may learn a lesson from these facts as to the future results of their resistance of the equal rights of others.

(*Second reason—does not provide a sufficient guarantee for the religious principles and morals of Students.*)

2. Secondly, the Toronto University College system provides no sufficient guarantee for the religious principles and morals of students, and is not therefore entitled to be the only endowed College of Upper Canada. A late Act of Parliament declares the *preambles* to be a part of the Acts themselves; and the Preamble of the Toronto University Acts speaks of "many persons being deterred by the expense and *other causes* from sending the youth under their charge to be educated in a large city distant, in many cases from their homes," who "from these and other causes do and will prosecute and complete their studies in other institutions in various parts of this Province, to whom *it is just and right* to afford *facilities* for obtaining those scholastic honors and rewards which their diligence and proficiency may deserve, and thereby to encourage them in the pursuit of knowledge and sound learning; and whereas experience both proved the principles embodied in Her Majesty's Royal Charter to the University of London in England to be well adapted for the attainment of the objects aforesaid, and for removing the difficulties and objections referred to; Be it enacted," &c.

From these words of the Statute, two things are clear; first, that the Legislature intended to afford the same facilities for the prosecution of University education in institutions in other parts of the Province as in Toronto; secondly, that there were "other causes" than that of "expense," to deter parents from sending their sons to so "distant" and

"large a city" as Toronto to pursue the studies of an University education. Those "other causes" are doubtless moral cases, and are painfully exemplified in the ruined principles, morals, and prospects of more than one youth who have come to Toronto for the noblest purposes, but without the restraints and counsels of home, or the oversight and influences of a church institution of their own, and have fallen untimely victims to the temptations and vices of "a large city." It is true that in the best regulated families, and in the best conducted Colleges of Christian Churches, there are instances of the triumph of youthful passions and vicious propensities over all the means and influences exerted to check and control them; but those instances are "few and far between" in comparison of what they are in a "large city," and with no substitute for a parent's care and a pastor's oversight in the exercises, instructions, and discipline of a religious institution. It is also true, that many young men of established religious principles and habits may come to Toronto and be proof against all the temptations to which they are exposed, and extract the good without being contaminated by the bad; but they are noble exceptions, and owe nothing of their principles and feelings to Toronto College life or influences, and present very different cases from those of boys from fourteen to eighteen years of age coming to Toronto and remaining for years without any substitute for a parent and pastor's instructions and oversight. It is doubtless true, likewise, that the Theological Colleges of certain Presbyterian churches (now about to be united in one) exercise effective care and influence over the numerous students of those churches attending Toronto University College. Were it not for this happy incident of juxtaposition, by which they can care for student members of their own churches, and use Toronto University College as an appendage of their own for the scholastic teaching of their theological students, they would doubtless be amongst the most earnest and able advocates of denominational Colleges.

But these individual cases and denominational incidents, and the fact that many students of University College are residents of Toronto, do not affect the general facts and considerations above referred to, and which show how contrary to the intentions of the Legislature is the supposition, and how insufficient is the guarantee for the religious principles and morals of youth throughout the country, that Toronto University College alone should be endowed for the College education of all Upper Canada.

(*Third reason—kind of education given defective.*)

3. Thirdly, the kind of education given in Toronto University College is not worthy of a national institution, and does not give it any claim to be the only endowed college of the country. I need here only refer to the *second* and *third* of the preceding letters for proofs and illustrations of the kind of education provided in that College, arising from its low standard of matriculation and its unnumbered options, which may impart a vague and superficial knowledge of several things, but cannot discipline the mind, invigorate the powers of thought, or bestow any thorough scholarship. The magnificence of the building cannot compensate for the meagre and piebald character of the curriculum. The single argument for one college centralization at Toronto, is establishing and maintaining a high

standard of University education; but the outstanding fact in the recent history of that College is lowering the standard and enervating the system of University education given there. Fact is stronger than theory, and in this case contradicts and destroys it.

(Its system of management not compatible with the legitimate functions of Government.)

4. Fourthly, the Toronto one-college monopoly system is incompatible with the appropriate functions of Government, which accounts for both its expensiveness and inefficiency, and is a fourth reason against its claims to exclusive public support. It is a great error in government of any kind to govern too much. BURKE has well said, that "the first problem in legislation is to determine what the State ought to take upon itself to direct by public wisdom, and what it ought to leave with as little interference as possible to individual exertions." In no department of government is this problem more important than in that of education. In despotisms, the government is, of course, the sole educator of the people, as well as sole maker of railroads and director of the press. But in a free country, government should do nothing in educational matters which the people can do themselves. Government should be the watchful guardian and liberal patron of education, to aid the people to educate themselves, not to educate them independent of their own co-operation. Government should not erect school-houses and appoint school-masters, for general education, any more than it should build railroads and manufactures for general improvement, though it should encourage and aid local exertion in the work of education, and see that public money be applied only in support of teachers duly qualified, and might encourage and perhaps aid parties, in certain circumstances, to build railroads, and provide guarantees and inspection for public security and convenience. Upper Canada College is the only Grammar School, and University College the only College, in Upper Canada, which the Government has established on its own account,* and

* I am aware it may be said that the Normal and Model Schools have been established by Government, and are managed by its authority. In reply, I observe that these schools were established for special purposes, which could not be attained in any one school, and which were designed for the benefit of all the schools—to train teachers and furnish a model for them, and not as rivals to any one of them, as the Toronto University College is to other Colleges. The Model Grammar School was designed to do what had not been done in any school in Upper Canada—to present an example or model of the manner in which a Grammar School should be arranged, governed, and its various subjects classified and taught, and then to provide for the training of teachers for the Grammar Schools. It was necessary to accomplish the former of these objects, before commencing the latter. The former object has been fully attained, and entrance upon the latter is only delayed for want of means. Except as the only effectual means of improving the Grammar Schools of the country, the establishment of the Model Grammar School could not be justified.

But these Schools have not only been established for special purposes—which do not come within the province of the other schools—but they have been established upon a different principle—namely, the principle of individual responsibility, and not of both corporate and individual irresponsibility, as have Upper Canada and University Colleges. It is known that Corporations without any individual responsibility, are the worst of all agencies to receive

what has been the history of both but one of perplexity and embarrassment to the government, of large and increased expenditures with comparatively small results, and successive but fruitless attempts at amelioration? As early as 1835, the Legislative Assembly of Upper Canada, complained in an address to the King, that "The Upper Canada College is upheld at great public expense, with high salaries to its principal masters, but that the Province in general derives very little advantage from it, and that it might be dispensed with." The same complaint has been repeated again and again from that time to this; successive enquiries have been made, and new Boards of Management have been appointed; yet Upper Canada College is confessedly less efficient and less beneficial to the country, while it is very much more expensive, now, than it was twenty years ago. The same is true of University College since its first establishment, though Act after Act has been passed, expensive inquiries instituted, and three successive names given it, and three successive Senates with various modifications, have been appointed to reform and improve it, yet the education it now gives, with its eleven professors, and vastly augmented expenditure, is manifestly less thorough and efficient than that given when it bore the name of King's College, and Toronto University, with a staff of five professors, and at less than half of its present current expenses!

Now, why is it that during the last fifteen years and more, every other educational institution in the country has advanced in efficiency and in public confidence, while Upper Canada College Grammar School and University College have declined in efficiency as they have increased in expensiveness? Must there not be something radically wrong in the system itself—some organic disease which the temporary remedies tried have never reached? Is it not that government has from the beginning undertaken to do what government cannot do, except very clumsily, very inefficiently, and very expensively? Is it likely that the history of the future will be different from the history of the past, without an essential change in the system of management? The nature of the change is foreign to this topic of discussion; my present business is to show its necessity, and to prove that the one College monopoly involved in this system should not be perpetuated.*

(System proposed—difference between a Provincial University and University College.)

Without multiplying other reasons against this monopoly, I will now proceed to state a few reasons for the system proposed. What that system is, is known from the memorials of the advocates of University Reform,

---

and expend public money; but though the Chief Superintendent of Education is aided by a Council of Public Instruction, the law makes him individually responsible not only for the oversight of the schools and the management of his Department, but expressly declares him responsible for the expenditure of all moneys paid through him. In Ireland also there is a similar individual responsibility on the part of the President of each of the Queen's Colleges for every thing appertaining to his College; but there is no such responsibility in regard to the expenditures and management of the University funds, or of Upper Canada and University Colleges. The result is well known.

* This subject of the functions of government in regard to Colleges requires an extensive discussion. My limits here confine me to a very few thoughts.

which have been presented to the Legislature, and from the whole discussion. I have given an epitome of it at the conclusion of the first of these letters, pp. 6, 7. The advocates of a one College monopoly have sought to mistify this question by confounding the words *University* and *College*—by using them interchangeably—and by representing those who oppose the one College monopoly as endeavouring to pull down the Provincial University. I beg the reader therefore to bear in mind, that the University and University College are no more the same in law than are a County and a Township in that County. The law prohibits the University from teaching or employing any professor or teacher whatsoever. The University has, therefore, no more to do with teaching than has the Legislative Assembly. To oppose therefore a one College monopoly at Toronto is no more pulling down a Provincial University, than would be opposing the monopoly of all the public revenue by one County be pulling down the Legislature of Canada. This the advocates of monopoly know right well, and the principle of their advocacy on the University question is to give all the County funds to one Township alone, instead of placing all the Townships upon equal footing in respect to it; or giving all the revenue of the Province to one County, instead of expending it for the benefit of all parts of the Province. They would give the endowment for collegiate education to the College of one class of the population, whether the work of that College be much or little, be good or bad; the advocates of University Reform insist that the endowment for collegiate education should be given to the colleges of all classes of the population according to their work.

(*The Terms University and College defined—no Church and State union.*)

The University is the Legislative Body to make the regulations as to the nature, subjects, and standard of collegiate education, and the conditions on which degrees shall be conferred upon its students; and the Executive Body also, so far as to inspect and decide upon the work done.

The Colleges are institutions that do the work prescribed by the University, and to which their work is submitted, in the persons of the candidates educated by them, to be decided upon by the University. Now, the monopolists contend that the whole endowment for higher education should be given to one college only, while the party of equal rights maintain that all the colleges who do the work prescribed by the University, shall share in its endowment according to their works, whether they are denominational or non-denominational; that their being denominational or non-donominational shall not be a subject of inquisition, any more than a man's religious faith when he comes to exercise his right of franchise; but that each college shall be entitled to aid from the University endowment according to the *publicly prescribed educational work performed by such college;* that when two colleges do the same work, to proscribe one because it has religious faith, and endow another because it is of no religious faith, is as intolerant and persecuting as it is unjust and unchristian.

The question, therefore, has no more to do with "Church and State Union" than it has to do with the United States Union. Nor has it any

more to do with grants to churches than it has to do with grants to he moon.*. It has to do with colleges, and with colleges *not according to their denomination or non-denomination*, BUT ACCORDING TO THEIR WORKS.

(What a National System of Collegiate Education includes.)

The collegiate system of education, therefore, which I hold to be national, is that which includes an University common to all classes and all Colleges, and in connexion with which not one college only, but all Colleges shall be recognized and aided in proportion to the prescribed University work they perform. Some of my reasons for this liberal and comprehensive system are the following.

(First reason for such a system—it accords with the objects of the Royal Endowment.)

1st. It accords with the letter and spirit of the original despatch of the Duke of Portland in 1797, communicating the intention of His Majesty George III., to set apart a portion of the Crown Lands for the purpose of higher education in Upper Canada. That despatch directed the setting apart of a large quantity of Crown Lands. "First for the establishment of Free Grammar Schools, in those districts in which they may be called for, and then in due process of time for establishing *Seminaries of a larger and*

---

* While these sheets are passing through the press, my attention has been directed to a printed "Petition (to Parliament) by and on behalf of the Annual Meeting of Subscribers to the Canadian Congregational Theological Institute (now bearing the name of Congregational College of Brit'' North America) held in Montreal on the 15th day of June, 1860." This P n is a protest against the Wesleyan "appeal made to the Legislature at ' session for the division of the endowment of the University of Toronto and University College among 'all the colleges now established, or which may be established in Upper Canada,' most of such colleges being under the control of ecclesiastical Bodies." The argument of this petition against the Wesleyan Memorial, is that it asks for a "*Sectarian distribution* of the University endowment," that it involves the principle of grants to churches, and the union of church and state, the semblance of which should be removed. These statements are not only disproved by what I have said in the text, but by the express declaration of the Wesleyan Conference Memorials, both of the last and the present year. In the State of New York, the State Literature Fund is distributed among the Seminaries of Learning throughout the State, upon the same principle as that prayed for in the Wesleyan Memorial in regard to the distribution of the University Fund; and among said seminaries are those under the control of the Congregationalists and Baptists, as well of the Methodists and Presbyterians; men have too much intelligence there to call such a system Church and State Union. But there is no institution in all Canada whose "Subscribers" are so largely relieved by means of the University endowment as those to the very "Canadian Congregational Theological Institute" from which this Petition emanates. Its classical tutor is actually the salaried classical tutor and Registrar, of University College and its students have received their educational instruction by attending the lectures in University College, or by the teachings of its Tutor. Here is not indeed "Church and State Union," not indeed "a sectarian distribution" of a State endowment, but a Theological Institute having one of its two instructors salaried by a State endowment, and that Institute living half its life in a State endowed College! The Wesleyans repudiate any endowment for a Theological Faculty or Professor; they ask no aid for their Literary College as a Church institution, nor for anything that it

more comprehensive nature," [that is, of course, *Universities or Colleges*] "*for the promotion of religious and moral learning, and the study of the Arts and Sciences.*" How can this object of the Royal gift be accomplished by endowing one Seminary or College alone? and that one which ignores all "religious learning," in connexion with the arts and sciences? The object of the endowment can only be attained by the endowment of more higher Seminaries than one, and those combining "religious and moral learning with the study of the arts and sciences."

2. The system of one Provincial University with Colleges in different parts of the Province, equally facilitated and encouraged in their instructions, alone accords with the preamble, and acknowledged intentions and provisions of the University act of 1858, as has been found in the preceding letters, as well as on other occasions.

3. The Collegiate system which I advocate *is in harmony with the fundamental principles of our Common School system.* The fundamental principle of that system is not, as has been absurdly stated, "the non-sectarian principle," for it has provided for both *Protestant and Roman Catholic* Schools from the beginning; and the law leaves it entirely with the elected Board of School Trustees in Cities, Towns, and Incorporated Villages to establish Denominational Schools or not, just as they please. If the electors in any of these Municipalities prefer Denominational Schools and elect a Board of Trustees accordingly, they can establish any kind or description of school they think proper, whether Church of England, Presbyterian, Roman Catholic, male or female, &c. This I have stated in my official reports from year to year, when parties have

---

may do as such; but they demand that the non-denominational University educational work it does shall be recognized and aided the same as the kindred work of a non-denominational College. Here is the same secular educational work done by two colleges—the one under denominational control, the other under the control of no denomination. This "Congregational Theological Institute" would proscribe the work of the former because its control is denominational, and endow the work of the latter because its control is non-denominational! And after all half live itself on a State endowment!! How much intense sectarianism lives under the garb of professed non-sectarian liberality!

It is worthy of remark, that the only religious bodies that have formally advocated the Toronto University College Monopoly are those who have Theological Institutes or Colleges in Toronto, the elements of whose educational life are largely, if not wholly, derived from University College—the names of the Theological students equally appearing in the lists of University College students—a convenient and profitable partnership, at least on one side. Neither I, nor I believe any other advocate of University reform—can have objection to such an arrangement; nay I admire the sagacity of it; but surely Theological institutions that flourish so luxuriously in the clover of State University endowment ought not to begrudge their neighbours of other religious persuasions a few wisps in their non-theological work of literary education. Least of all, ought they to employ epithets, and make representations, and ascribe motives and principles, that misrepresent the sentiments and proceedings and characters of their neighbors. How different was the great and Good Dr. Chalmers' appreciation of education in connexion with Christian Churches, when he said, "*It is the Churches and Colleges of England in which is fostered into maturity and strength almost all the massive learning of our nation.*"

demanded provisions for Denominational Schools.* I have said that in the rural parts of the country, they could not be sustained, though even there could be a Protestant and Roman Catholic School in every Section if the people desired ; † that in the cities, towns and villages where alone Denominational Schools can be sustained, the electors have the power entirely in their own hands. Ignorance of the law alone, therefore, could have prompted the statement in the Petition of "the Canadian Congregational Theological Institute" to the Legislature, that the fundamental principle of our school system is "the non-Sectarian principle." That is an incident, not a fundmental principle of the system.

The fundamental principle of the School system is two-fold, First, the right of the parent and pastor to provide religious instruction for their children; and to have facilities for that purpose. While the law protects each pupil from compulsory attendance at any religious reading or exercise against the wish of his parent; it also provides that within that limitation, "pupils shall be allowed to receive such religious instruction as their parents and guardians shall desire, according to the general regulations which shall be provided according to law." The general regulations provide, that the parent may make discretionary arrangements with the teacher on the subject, and that the clergyman of any Church shall have the right to any school-house being within his charge for one hour in the week between four and five, for the religious instruction of the pupils of his own Church. Be it observed then, the supreme right of the parent and the corresponding right of the pastor in regard to the religious instruction of youth, even in connexion with day schools, where children are with their parents

---

* It is to be observed that the law does not prescribe any particular kind of schools in cities and towns or any particular mode of supporting them. The electors of each of such Municipalities, through their elective Board of Trustees, are empowered without any restriction "to determine the number, *kind* and *description* of schools which shall be established or maintained in such City or Town." The Board of Trustees in any City or Town, (also in any incorporated Village by the 26th section of the same act 13 and 14 Vic. cap. 48,) may establish and maintain Church of England, Roman Catholic, Presbyterian, Wesleyan, Baptist or Congregational schools, and appoint a committee of three from each church to the immediate care of the school designed for its members, as I stated in the first official circular, after the passing of the law in 1850. *Special Report on Separate Schools*, 1858, *page* 51. *See also Report for* 1857, *page* 43.

† It has been objected, that if denominational Colleges are re-organized as a part of the Collegiate system of the Country, it will soon lead to the establishment of denominational schools, and the subversion of the common school system. The author of this objection could not have understood his subject. He must have been ignorant of the fact, that the people can have denominational schools in all the cities, towns and villages of Upper Canada, if they desire them; that they have a right to such schools as they desire; and they can be trusted with their own affairs and interests, which they will understand just as well in future years as they do now. The constitution and management of schools must always be determined by the people themselves, and can no more be affected than their teaching, by the constitution and management of Colleges. As well might it be said, we must have no denominational organizations, lest we have denominational schools. The objection is one of mere partizanship, and is without substance or foundation.

more than half of each week-day and the whol of each Sunday, is a fundamental principle of the Common School system. The less or greater extent to which that right may be exercised in various places, does not affect the *principle* or right itself, which is fundamental in the system. The second fundamental principle in the School system is the co-operation and aid of the State with each locality or section of the community as a condition of, and in proportion to local effort. This is a vital principle of the School system, and pervades it throughout, and is a chief element of its success. No public aid is given until a school-house is provided, and a legally qualified teacher is employed, when public aid is given in proportion to the work done in the school; that is in proportion to the number of children taught, and the length of time the school is kept open; and public aid is given for the purchase of school maps and apparatus, and prize books and libraries, in proportion to the amount provided from local sources. To the applicaton of that principle between the State and the inhabitants of localities, there is no exception whatever, except in the single case of distributing a sum not exceeding £500 per annum in aid of poor school sections in new Townships, and then their local effort must precede the application for a special grant.

Such are the two fundamental principles of the School system, on which I have more than once dwelt at large in official reports.

Now apply those principles to the Collegiate system of the country. First, The united right and duty of the parent and pastor. Should that be suspended when the son is away from home, or should it be provided for? Let parental affection and conscience, and not blind or heartless partizanship, reply. If, then, the combined care and duty of the parent and pastor are to be provided for as far as possible when the son is pursuing the higher part of his education, for which he must leave home, can that be done best in a denominational or non-denominational College? But one answer can be given to this question. The religious and moral principles feelings and habits of youth are paramount. Scepticism and partizanship may sneer at them as "sectarian," but religion and conscience will hold them as supreme. If the parent has the right to secure the religious instruction and oversight of his son at home, in connection with his school education, has he not a right to do so when his son is abroad? and is not the State in duty bound to afford him the best facilities for that purpose? And how can that be done so effectually—nay, how can it be effectually done at all—except in a college which, while it gives the secular education required by the State, responds to the parent's heart and faith to secure the higher interests which are beyond all human computation, and without the cultivation of which society itself cannot exist. It is a mystery of mysteries, that men of conscience, men of religious principle and feeling, can be so far blinded by sectarian jealousy and partizanship, as to desire for one moment to withhold from youth, at the most feeble, most tempted, most eventful period of their educational training, the most potent guards, helps and influences to resist and escape the snares and seductions of vice, and to acquire and become established in those principles, feelings

and habits which will make them true Christians at the same time that they are educated men. Even in the interests of civilization itself, what is religious and moral stands far before what is merely scholastic and refined. The Hon. EDWARD EVERETT has truly said, in a late address, "It is not political nor military power, but *moral sentiments, principally under the guidance and influence of religious zeal,* that has in all ages civilized the world." What creates civilization can alone preserve and advance it. The great question, after all, in the present discussion, is not which system will teach the most classics, mathematics, &c., (although I shall consider the question in this light presently), but which system will best protect, develop and establish those higher principles of action, which are vastly more important to a country itself—apart from other and immortal considerations—than any amount of intellectual attainments in certain branches of secular knowledge. Colleges under religious control may fall short of their duty and their powers of religious and moral influence ; but they must be, as a general rule, vastly better and safer than a College of no religious control or character at all. At all events, one class of citizens have much more valid claims to public aid for a College that will combine the advantages of both secular and religious education, than have another class of citizens to public aid for a College which confers no benefit beyond secular teaching alone. It is not the sect, it is society at large that most profits by the high religious principles and character of its educated men. An efficient religious College must confer a much greater benefit upon the State than a non-religious College can, and must be more the benefactor of the State than the State can be to it by bestowing any ordinary amount of endowment. It is therefore in harmony with the first fundamental principle of the Common School system, as well as with the highest interests of society at large, that the best facilities be provided for all that is affectionate in the parent and faithful in the pastor during the away-from-home-education of youth ; and that is a College under religious control, whether that control be of the Church of the parent or not.

I will next consider the second fundamental principle of our Common School system in relation to Colleges—*namely, the co-operation of the State with localities or sections of the community as a condition of, and in proportion to, local effort.* This principle of the Common School system is, *each section of the community receives public aid in proportion to the teaching work it does ;* that is, not in proportion to the amount of money it provides, but *in proportion to the number of children it teaches in the subjects of Common School education, and the length of time it teaches them*—the section of the community, as a preliminary condition, first providing a school-house and employing a teacher.

Now, apply this principle of the Common School education to the system of collegiate education. The section of the community first provides the building and employs the professors. The State determines the kind or curriculum of education which shall be taught, and then the State aids the section of the community in

proportion to the number of students it teaches in that curriculum of education. This is the system of collegiate education advocated by the friends of University reform ; and is it not the fundamental principle of our Common School system ? On the contrary, the advocates of one college monopoly repudiate altogether this fundamental principle in the Common School system, in relation to the collegiate system. As a preliminary condition of public aid, they erect no college building ; they employ no professors ; and they do not a certain amount of collegiate teaching, and then ask public aid in proportion to the work they have done ; they do nothing, contribute nothing to the great work of collegiate education, but as drones and cormorants, depend alone, feed alone, and claim to devour alone the State endowment for everything ; and then even have the heart and assurance to denounce as selfish and sectarian the bee industry of their fellow-citizens for insisting upon sharing in the bread of the common hive in proportion to their own contributions of educational honey to it ! If the principle of effort on the part of local sections of the community as a condition of public aid swells that aid of about *one-hundred-and-eighty thousand dollars* per annum into a sum of more than *twelve hundred thousand dollars* per annum for common school purposes, and contributes proportionably to both the extension and elevation of common school education ; why shall not the same principle be acted upon and be productive of corresponding effects in the system of collegiate education ? If the principle is one of such vitality, fertility, and amazing public benefit in the common school system of the country, why is it to be repudiated in the collegiate system ?

Whether the section of the community putting forth the efforts and fulfilling the conditions of public aid, be a municipal section or a denominational section, is a mere incident ; does not affect the State, is no part of its concern or business ; the principle of co-operation is the same ; the work is the same ; the education is the same ; the public benefit is the same ; and the public aid should be the same.

The basis of operations for the establishment and support of a Seminary of learning must of course be larger or smaller in proportion to its magnitude and character. In England there are some County Colleges ; there may at a future time be the same in some counties of Canada. At present the limits and influence of a denomination are not more than commensurate for the establishment and support of a college, in connexion with the legal and equitable conditions of public aid. The members of some persuasions may prefer to send their sons to a College of another persuasion, essentially agreeing with their faith rather than incur the expense and burden of establishing one themselves ; and some may choose for their sons a College under no religious control. But by whomsoever a College may have been or may be established, the true theory is that of the fundamental principle of the Common School system—aid of the state as a supplement to and on the condition of effort on the part of some section of the community, and for teaching the subjects required by the state system of education. They may teach what other subjects they please, but at their

own expense. Let those then who advocate the vital principles of the Common School system, not become truants to them when applied to themselves in respect to a system of collegiate education. Let them put their hands in their pockets and their shoulders to the wheel of action; let them erect their College buildings and employ their professors; collect students into their halls; and then let them demand and receive aid from the Hercules of the State, not as a favour, but as a legal right, and upon legal terms, in proportion to public educational work done. Then they will be consistent with their professed principles; then they will eat of their own bread and drink from their own cistern; and not sponge upon the State for their education without doing anything themselves; then they will develop and enjoy the noble feelings of self-reliance, and multiply the financial resources and beneficent influence of Christian collegiate education. The "Subscribers to the Canadian Congregational Theological Institute" should show "their faith by their works," in the fundamental principles of the Common School system, to which they appeal on the University question itself, and not invoke an incident of that system as a pretext to justify their own inactivity, and get a false weapon of attack against their more liberal and active neighbors.

It is remarkable that the Congregationalists in England object to the right of the State to educate at all—maintain that it is the right and duty of the Church to educate its own youth, whether in the elementary school or College—a duty which it cannot abandon without unfaithfulness to God and society—and have Education Societies, Colleges and Schools as the fruit of their faith and charity; while in Canada they deny that the Church has any thing to do with education, and insist that the State has everything to do with it! It is a curious moral and social phenomenon (which I will not here attempt to explain) to see a fountain of this kind sending forth "sweet and bitter waters at the same time."

But on the other hand, the advocates of University Reform act consistently; they give the Common School system their warmest prayers and heartiest support; and as a proof of their faith in it for national, and not selfish purposes, they carry up its fundamental principles to the system of collegiate education, and act and work accordingly. And I am perfectly persuaded that the application of these principles to the system of Colleges, will in ten years produce a greater *extension* and *improvement* in the collegiate education of the country, than has the application of the same principles during the last ten years produced in the extension and improvement of Common School education.

Having, I trust, demonstrated that the views of the advocates of University reform are not only in harmony with the fundamental principles of our Common School system, but the true and legitimate extension of them to the College system, I had intended to state and illustrate at some length, three other reasons in support of these views;—namely, that they involve a College system the most economical—the best adapted to promote the interests of our common Christianity and public morality among educated men, and the best adapted to diffuse most widely the advantages of Collegiate education. But these important subjects have been incidentally glanced at in this and the preceding letters; and my limits

will not permit me further to enlarge upon them on this occasion. I shall only therefore add four other reasons for the University and College system which I advocate.

(*Fifth reason—equally just to all classes and parties.*)

5. The system contended for is equally just to all classes and parties. The Toronto non-denominational College meets, it appears, the views of one portion of the community. The advocates of University reform say, let the partizans of Toronto University College be gratified by its continued and sufficient endowment; but let the same consideration be shown to other sections of the community who have evinced their zeal and views in regard to Collegiate education by their contributions and the establishment of Colleges upon the principles of their Christian faith. Is the Legislature—is the Government—to support and endow alone the College of one section of the community, and not equally endow the Colleges of those sections of the communiry who do something themselves for Collegiate education, and associate it with the higher influences of our Divine Christianity? When Her Majesty's Government (not regarding the great Trinity College, Dublin, as sufficient for Ireland,) determined to extend the facilities of Collegiate education there, by the establishment of the Queen's Colleges, it did not proceed after the Toronto centralization scheme to erect one National College, and bundle together in it all classes and creeds from all parts of Ireland. No, it had regard to the different parts of Ireland (a small country in comparison of Upper Canada), and to the different classes for whose benefit the Collegiate education was intended. It created one University as a regulating and inspecting Board—requiring but a single Secretary, and executing all its University functions at an expense of, for Secretary £350 per annum; for "incidental, Office Expenses, Postage, Messengers, Advertisements, &c., £180; for Prizes and Medals, £475"—a rare example of economy in comparison of Toronto University administration. The Government then erected three Colleges in three different parts of Ireland, constituting each College in reference to the religious views and feelings of three principal classes of the community—appointing a member of the Church of England at the head of one College, a distinguished Roman Catholic at the head of another, and a Presbyterian clergyman at the head of the third. To show how Her Majesty's Government consulted both the religious views and interests of parties concerned in the establishment of these Colleges, I will select the example of that at Belfast. The Presbyterians are numerous in that part of Ireland; their General Assembly was about erecting a College of their own. Her Majesty's Government proposed to adapt Queen's College, Belfast, to their purposes. Negotiations ensued. Sir Robert Peel was Prime Minister. The Moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, (Rev. R. Wilson, D.D.) says, in his evidence before the Queen's Commissioners on Irish Colleges in 1858,—"Though we had made considerable progress, and a certain

amount of subscriptions had been put down for the purpose of erecting a College for ourselves, we were led to suspend our operations until it should be seen whether the College to be established in the North of Ireland would be suitable for our object. We had the strong assurance of Sir Robert Peel on the subject. One of his statemets was to the effect, that he intended the northern College to be a boon to the public at large, and *especially to the Presbyterians in the North of Ireland, and he hoped it would be so arranged as to suit our object.*" The General Assembly, in October, 1849, passed a resolution of approval and satisfaction, stating that, "Her Majesty's Government have enabled us to provide for the religious instruction of all our students by the endowment of a Theological Faculty under our own exclusive jurisdiction ; one of our ministers, in whose capacity and paternal care we have entire confidence, has been appointed Dean of Residences, to whom has been committed the constant inspection and care of the conduct of the students," &c. This is one of the non-denominational Colleges in Ireland to which Mr. Langton has appealed as the latest expression of what Her Majesty's Government have thought it necessary to provide for in regard to University education, and as an example against the claims of denominational Colleges ! But how very differently do the Toronto College monopolists treat the views of those religious persuasions who insist upon the necessity of providing for the constant care and oversight of the religious instruction and conduct of youth during their course of collegiate studies. On the other hand, the system of Colleges advocated by University reformers is equally just and liberal to all parties, while it duly provides for the religious instruction, constant care and oversight of students during the four years of their collegiate education, and is the only system by which religious persuasions can provide for what Government itself provided in behalf of Presbyterians in Queen's College, Belfast—the daily religious care and oversight of youth at college. The justice of it to all parties, and the importance of it in a religious and moral point of view, are therefore as clear as day.

6. Equally important is the system I advocate to secure a high and thorough system of University education. It has been shown how low and loose is the present system ; but if a University with a Senate be established which has no identity with any one College, and is not therefore the instrument to build up one College to the exclusion of all others, it will only consider what is best for University education at large, irrespective of any one College. And this is the true position and proper duty of a Provincial Senate. It is not its province to fill the halls of a particular College by every appliances of reductions,* options, scholarships, prizes, abolition of fees,

* The repeated assertions of Mr. Langton, echoed by Dr. Wilson, that the standard of admission and course of studies in Toronto University are not lower than those in the English and Irish Universities being so contrary to the whole body of facts and illustrations adduced in the preceding letters, cannot be reconciled with sincerity, except upon the ground that they were meant *relatively* and not absolutely; that is, that the Toronto University standard

&c.; but its province is to consider what the whole country requires in the nature and character of University education, and prescribe regulations, courses of study and examinations accordingly. Then when the various Colleges are brought into competition—their respective undergraduates tested by the same standard and examination questions, who does not see that, while the system of University education itself established by an impartial Provincial Body will be more solid and comprehensive, and the examinations conducted by it more reliable, the several Colleges will be stimulated by emulation, and their students by competition to exercise their greatest diligence and put forth their best efforts. Emulation and competition are the life-blood of energy and activity in most pursuits of man. But in all fair competition there must be equality of conditions; and there must be "free trade" and "no monopoly" among Colleges any more than among statesmen, or merchants, or tradesmen, in order to attain the highest excellence and advance most the general interests.*

---

is as high for Canada as the English University standard is for England. There are some Englishmen, and now and then a Scotchman, who think that Canadians, whether of Anglo-Saxon or French Origin, are "an inferior race" to gentlemen from the "Old Country"—especially from college halls—that anything is good enough for Canada, and "colonists," particularly of the second and succeeding generations, in "this Canada of ours," should not think of equalling or standing upon equal footing with the high-bred men of "our glorious Father Land." It was in reference to this sentiment and feeling that the following remarks were made in my defence of the Petitioners before the University Committee at Quebec:

"I do not stand here as the advocate of the Oxford system of education, but I do advocate something of the thoroughness and disciplinary training practiced on the young men who go to Oxford." "If we have a College education at all in Upper Canada, it should be a good one. It is not worth while putting the country to the expense of a Collegiate education that only advances a couple of steps beyond the Grammar Schools. It is not just to the country or its future that we should have such a system, unless it is characterized by a thoroughness, a comprehensiveness, a practical character, that can stand some comparison with that of other countries. I submit that the youth of Canada are not deficient in intellect—though Dr. Wilson seemed to think it absurd that we should look as high as Oxford, where education, (as he says) costs at least $750 year, and where the English nobility are educated. Just as if money or title conferred intellect; as if a poor untitled Canadian may not, with the aid of competent and diligent Professors, equal in scholarship and science the wealthy titled Englishman! The University education for which all Upper Canada has been taxed ought to be a real University education, and not a mock imitation of it. We want our sons better educated than their fathers—educated so that they can stand on an equality with the educated men of any other country. Our aim should be to elevate the standard of education in all the Colleges, as well as schools; but how can that be accomplished when the only endowed University of the country sets the example of the downward instead of the upward course?"

* As to the objections which have been occasionally made, that a sufficient number of Professors would not be employed in the Colleges, if more than one was encouraged, and that the students would be few, I have answered these objections in my Defence of the Petitioners at Quebec. I have there shown that the average number of students entering each College at Oxford University is *eighteen and a half*—not so many as are annually matriculating in

7. I observe again, that the views maintained in these letters are the best adapted to combine the advantages of sound, classical and mathematical learning with the study of general science. Mr. Langton and Dr. Wilson have said much about teaching the different branches of Natural Science ; and the former has quoted the recommendations of Royal Commissioners in the English Universities in favour of permitting undergraduates a choice of studies in various Natural and Moral Science subjects during the last year of their University undergraduateship. But the Commissioners propose to attain these objects by the very means for which I have contended and which Mr. Langton and Dr. Wilson have opposed—namely, by *raising*, instead of *lowering*, the standard of matriculation in the University, and by raising and concentrating the first two years' course of studies on the essential subjects of classics and mathematics. The Oxford Reform Commissioners therefore recommend not only a matriculation examination before the candidates are admitted into the University at all, instead of what is at Oxford called "responsions"—(an examination required to be passed before the seventh term) but that that matriculation examination should be equal to the former "*responsions*" examination, which has been shown in a previous letter to equal the Toronto pass examination for a degree. The Commissioners recommend, "That there should be a public examination for all young men before matriculation ;" and say, "Our opinion is, that the subjects for this examination should be nearly the same as those now enjoined at Responsions." On this point, Archbishop Whately, (in his evidence quoted by the Commissioners) says—"As far as regards University Reform, I have long been convinced that the very first step should be a University Examination, preliminary to matriculation. If every thing else be put on the best possible footing, and that one point omitted, you will have a plan which will look well on paper, but will never work satisfactorily. If, on the other hand, this one reform were

---

either Queen's or Victoria College. In 1845 when the first proposal to centralize Collegiate education in Toronto, the present President of University College wrote a pamphlet (entitled "the University Question Considered") against the scheme of centralization. On the two objections above alluded to, he remarks as follows :

"The Head, with four Professors, would be fully equal, for some years, to the discharge of the University duties" (p. 56)

"In the Faculty of Arts the Professors must for some years be content to discharge chiefly the duties of Tutors ; and under the circumstances, the smallness of their classes is rather an advantage, inasmuch as it enables them to test the preparation and ascertain the deficiencies of the students on every occasion of attendance"

I may add, that it is not the number of pupils or the magnificence of the building that makes either a good School or a good College. There may be a large number of pupils and a fine building, yet an inferior School ; there may also be a small number of pupils and a very plain building, and yet an excellent school. It is so with a College. But the average number of undergraduates in the Canadian Colleges is already larger than in the Colleges of Oxford University.

introduced, and no other at present, it would be easy afterwards to introduce indefinite improvements : indeed, some would even grow up from it spontaneously."

This examination, (preliminary to entering the University) equal to the former examination called "responsions," is recommended for the purpose of allowing the introduction of scientific studies during the last year of the course, without diminishing the classics and mathematics heretofore required.* After this preliminary examination, and then after a second examination (heretofore the first) called responsions, but more strict ; and then after a third Public Examination, called the Intermediate Examination, and to be passed during the third year, (the high character of which has been shown in a preceding letter) the Commissioners recommend that students, after having given satisfactory evidence of classical knowledge at the Intermediate Examination, be allowed a choice of studies in the following subjects or "schools," as they are technically termed, namely—"Theology ; Mental Philosophy and Philology ; Jurisprudence and History, including Political Economy ; Mathematical and Physical Science." The same choice of studies is recommended to be allowed at Cambridge,† after the students have passed what is there called the Previous Examination, and which corresponds to the "Intermediate Examination at Oxford, and which is made as high as the former examination for a degree, as I have shown in a preceding letter.

It will thus be seen that the mode of introducing studies of mod-

---

* In the calendar of Trinity College, Toronto the following regulations are given in regard to scientific studies :

"In addition to the Mathematical Lectures for the degree of B.A., students of the second and third years are required to attend a Course of Lectures on Optics, Astronomy, Sound, and the Theory of Light popularly treated. The course will extend over two years, and the Lectures will be given in the Michaelmas and Lent Terms. Students of the third year will also be required to attend during the Easter Term a Course of Lectures on Fortification. Questions on all these subjects will be introduced on the examination for B. A.

"Students of the second year will be required to attend a course of Lectures on Surveying during the Easter Term, and questions on the subject will be introduced into their examination at the end of the Term.

"The Lectures on General and Organic Chemistry have particular reference to Agricultural Chemistry ; those on Experimental Philosophy to Heat, Electricity, Light in its Relation to Chemistry, and Photography.

"Lectures on Physiology in its relation to Natural Theology. Attendance on these Lectures is required of Students of the third year, and the subject is added to the subjects in the Annual Examination of that year.

† The introduction of the choice of studies during the latter part of the course at Cambridge, and the permission of options in several subjects of Moral and Natural Science, was a concession to a popular demand. But the result has not been as successful as had been anticipated. One of the writers of the Cambridge Essays for 1855, says—"These new regulations, though framed to meet the spirit of the age, have failed in producing any practical change. The curriculum has been extended, but no one will enter for the new races. The Moral and Natural Triposes present, year after year, a singular spectacle—more examiners than examinees. The experiment, in the opinion of even those most anxious that it should be tried, is admitted to be a failure."

ern science in the English Universities, is by raising the standard of admission, and by making the studies of the first two years and upwards, more than ever severally classical and mathematical—thus requiring a strict examination equal to the former examination for a degree, and then allowing options or choice of studies in the sciences. On this subject, that sweeping reform quarterly, the *London Westminster Review* for last July says:—"The principle upon which an University curriculum should be framed is pretty generally admitted. It is agreed by all whose opinion is of weight, that the new studies should be introduced *without displacing the old.*" This is what the Commissioners have recommended in regard to both Oxford and Cambridge. But this is the reverse of what Mr. Langton and Dr. Wilson have done in the Toronto University. They "displace the old studies" by reducing the standard of admission more than a year's studies—admit boys at 14—introduce *five departments* of studies the first year and *six* departments the second year, and as many the third and fourth years, and then a system of pick and choose among these "departments" and the more numerous "branches" of them from the end of the first year! On the other hand the University Reform Commissioners in England recommend that the standard of admission even at Oxford should be made higher than it was before, and that followed by between two and three years of classical studies and two public examinations, before the essential studies of Classics and Mathematics are allowed to be omitted by any student, or impeded by various other studies. In accordance with these views, I have insisted that the standard of admission in the Toronto University ought not to be lowered, nor the essential studies of an University diminished by the immediate multiplication of other studies, and then soon made optional. There cannot be a high and thorough University education, without a high standard of admission; and it is only by making the standard of admission high, that the studies of modern science can be introduced during the latter part of the course, without so reducing as to render all but valueless the classical and mathematical studies of the course. When the mind is well disciplined and developed by these studies, it is then prepared to pursue the new studies. But as the system now is, in the Toronto University, what is said by one of the writers of the Cambridge Essays on another subject, is, to a great extent, realized in University College: "All the sciences, and all the arts, a dozen languages, ancient and modern, are offered at an unprecedentedly low figure." But this is any other thing than a sound University education. Such theories have been rife in the neighbouring States; but they are now passing away there, though taken up by Mr. Langton and Dr. Wilson here. * The superiority of Harvard, Yale, and Columbia

* Mr. Langton, in his speech, has made much ado about the scholarships, exhibitions, and fellowships at Oxford. My answer at Quebec was that these *scholarships* chiefly belonged to the Colleges, and not to the University, and that the colleges were not established centuries since, but were for the most

Colleges in maintaining the old and thorough curriculum of University studies, is now almost universally admitted. The matured judgment of the American best educated mind on this subject, is well expressed by Dr, Henry, author and editor of many American Text Books, and late Professor of Mental and Moral Science in the University of New York. He says :—

"Let the course of studies be 'liberal' studies. Let not the object be the acquisition of special knowledge for this or that particular destination in life. Let such special acquisitions come afterwards as any one may choose. Let the College course of undergraduate studies be mainly a discipline for the mind. Let it afford scope and means for the freest, fullest, and most harmonious development and culture of all the mental faculties, without reference to any particular destination in life; and for those acquisitions of knowledge and accomplishments of taste which form the true liberally educated man. And for this end, there is no conceivable organization of studies so well adapted as the good old-fashioned *curriculum* of classical, mathematical, logical, rhetorical and æsthetical studies. These studies, properly proportioned, and thoroughly pursued, involve and secure the best possible training of the mind."*

I cannot better conclude my argument on this point than in the beautiful language of the Rev. Principal Leitch, of Queen's College, Kingston, who, in his Inaugural Address, presents the following lucid view of the value, elements and training process of a sound Collegiate education :—

"A college education has always been regarded as a *sine quâ non* in the case of the learned professions, but it would be a grand mistake to think, that such an education would be thrown away on those who do not intend to pursue a professional career. It is not in Law, Medicine, or Theology alone that a college education is useful. The merchant, the legislator, the agriculturist, and the private gentleman, can derive equal advantage. For what is this higher education but a means for enabling a man, whatever his occupation or position in life may be, to fulfil his duties with more success, and to occupy

---

part the result of private beneficence, and not of State endowment at all. Appended to the report of the Oxford Commissioners, as given by Heywood, (p. 388) the present Regius Professor of History at Oxford (Mr. Goldwin Smith) gives an historical statement on the five Halls and nineteen colleges at Oxford. The Halls are minor colleges, in which students live under a Master in Arts, or Doctor in one of the Faculties, who is their Tutor. There were as many as 300 of these Halls in the reign of King Edward I. There are now only five. "The Colleges of Oxford (says Mr. Goldwin Smith) were founded at various periods, from the end of the thirteenth century to the end of the eighteenth. Fourteen of the nineteen, including Christ Church, were founded by Roman Catholics, though in some cases additional Fellowships, and more frequently Scholarships and Exhibitions, have been given to Roman Catholic foundations by Protestant benefactors."

It is the example of these Scholarships, Fellowships, and Exhibitions, that Mr. Langton adduces to justify so large expenditures of the University Funds in the establishment and support of the Toronto University Scholarship system!

* Social Welfare and Human Progress, pp. 121, 122. From an "Address before the Alumni Association of New York University," entitled, "*The true Idea of the University, and its Relation to a complete system of Public Instruction.*"

his position with greater dignity and influence? It ought not to be forgotten that the most valuable result of a college education is the mental culture rather than the technical acquirements of learning. No doubt a knowledge of Latin, Greek, mathematics, moral and natural philosophy has its special uses, which ought not to be overlooked, but, in a course of liberal education, the great object to be aimed at is the cultivation of the mental powers. We are to look, not so much to the knowledge itself as to the power of acquiring knowledge. The technical branches of learning are scaffolding, the training of the faculties is the solid structure. The scaffolding may be removed; a man may in after life, forget his College learning, but his labor has not been lost, if there remain the solid and enduring result, of a sound judgment, steady application and a refined taste, in short, the capability of excelling, whatever his pursuits in life may be. I might readily point to men distinguished in the various learned professions, who could not, now, demonstrate a single proposition of Euclid, construct a syllogism, or construe a difficult passage in a classic author, though once proficient in these various departments of college learning. But would it be just to conclude that their college course was of no value to them merely because they have forgotten the instruments of their training? No, such a conclusion would be most unjustifiable. Men may, amidst the pressure of professional avocations, lay aside, though not wisely, the knowledge they acquired at College, but they cannot, if distinction is to be gained, dispense with these mental habits and tastes which a college training conferred.

"The experience of long centuries has shown that, for general mental culture, there is no means to be compared to the study in early life of the ancient classic languages. Not only the memory but the judgment, logical accuracy of thought, and the exercise of a fine taste are necessarily brought into requisition. In no other languages can the nicer shades of thought and feelings be studied with so much advantage. Mathematics, though more limited in its range of mental culture, is admirably adapted to train to the more rigid forms of thought and logical deduction. And it is a happy arrangement, that, at the outset of a university career, classic refinement should be combined with the more robust exercise of the logic of geometry. A basis is thus laid for the more advanced studies of mental and physical science.

"Seeing that the main object in a liberal education is the culture of the mind, it is obvious that this object would not be gained by a too great range of subjects. The grand object in college training is not to store up as much loose knowledge as you can, but to master thoroughly whatever you attempt. Be ever ready to sacrifice range to thoroughness and precision. It is not uncommon to find in society men who astonish you by their varied knowledge, and yet who have no title to be regarded as learned men. On any one subject they may want sufficient precision to be useful, or mental vigor to turn their knowledge to account, and it is quite conceivable that knowledge may be acquired in such a way as to enfeeble rather than invigorate the mental powers. Be ready to submit, then, in youth, to the severest mental discipline, necessary to acquire completeness and accuracy of thought. When you pick up a pebble on the margin of the great ocean of truth, do not throw it from you to look at another, before you have thoroughly understood its nature. Look at it on every side, examine its internal structure, analyse it into its constituent elements; and not till you have thus thoroughly mastered its nature, proceed to pick up another. This, to impetuous youth, appears to be too slow a process, but be assured, that, in this way, you will ultimately gain a far wider range, and a far more thorough knowledge than you would by a more rapid but more slovenly process at the beginning. You will require, however, much self-denial to carry out this plan of study. It is a far easier task to acquire congenial knowledge than to discipline the faculties; far more agreeable to indolent minds to engage in mental dissipation and desultory reading, than sternly to restrict yourself to some task, requiring the exercise of severe thought, which you must and ought to master."

8. The last reason I shall assign for the system of Collegiate education I advocate is, *that it is conducive to the best interests of*

Grammar Schools. The point of separation between Grammar School education and Collegiate education determines the character of both. If the Collegiate education commences at a low standard, its character, at the end of the four years, will be correspondingly low. If it commences at a high standard, its character at the end of four years will be proportionally high. If, on the other hand, the termination of Grammar School education be low, the character and importance of the School must sink accordingly. But if the termination of Grammar School education be high, the character and importance of the Grammar School will be proportionably elevated. The standard of admission to the University therefore, advocated by Mr. Langton and Dr. Wilson, involves not only the character of the University education, as I have shown in this discussion, but also the character and interests of the Grammar Schools; and in advocating a high standard of admission to the University, I am at the same time advocating what is most important to the just rights and best interests of the Grammar Schools. One reason assigned by the Queen's Irish University Commissioners for establishing and maintaining a high standard of admission to the Queen's College in Ireland, is its "influence upon the general standard of Grammar School education throughout the country." And Archbishop Whately, in recommending to the Oxford University Commissioners a high preliminary examination before admission to the University, urged it not only as the best means of improving University education (as I have quoted above) and preparing the way for the extension of University studies, but also pressed it upon the ground of its salutary influence upon Grammar Schools, even in England. He says—"The introduction of a preliminary Examination would be *an inestimable stimulus to Schools.* They would then become more what schools ought to be, and the University would, instead of being a School (and a very poor one), become a real University." If such a remark would apply to England, where both the Grammar Schools and the Universities are so much above ours, with how much more force may it apply to Canada? How cruel, then, is the blow that Mr. Langton and Dr. Wilson have inflicted upon the Grammar School education of the country by depressing it to the extent of the best year of its work, while they have equally depressed the character and efficiency of University College, converting it into a Grammar School, and as Archbishop Whately says, "a very poor one," to do that year's Grammar Scool work, and consequently do one year less of its own proper work!

For more than forty years the Grammer Schools were the highest educational institutions of our country; and during that time, they produced a class of men that have as yet never had their equals in this country, whether (not to speak of the pulpit) at the Bar, in the Legislature, or on the Bench, besides many others. Charles and Jones Jones, John S. Cartwright, Robert Baldwin, Marshall S. Bidwell, Christopher Hagerman, Sir James Macaulay, Sir John Robinson, have as yet had no equal in their day (whether among University graduates from abroad or at home); and it remains to be seen whether they will have any equals

among their successors. With scarcely an exception, if not without exception, they gave (and one of them still gives, and may he long continue to give) to their country not only great talents and high attainments, but what every public man ought to give to his country, and what a country has a right to claim from its public men—*an example of private virtue*—the only bond of domestic society, the only safe-guard of public liberty; a service and legacy to a country far more valuable and patriotic than the most brilliant talents or the largest attainments. If a country may do without an University, it cannot do without Grammar Schools; and far better would it be for a country to be without an University, than that that University should be the instrument of depressing and impairing, instead of elevating and improving its Grammar Schools.

I have now done. Leaving the personalities of this discussion out of the question, I appeal to every statesman, patriot, Christian, of every sect and party, to every parent and lover of virtue and knowledge, whether the University and College system I have advocated, is not that which is best for both Grammer School and Collegiate education, most economical, most just to all parties, most in harmony with the fundamental principles of our Common School system, best adapted to develop that voluntary and beneficient activity on the part of both individuals and communities which is the life and glory of our age, most consonant with the proper functions of government and the true genius of our Divine Christianity, most conducive to the interests of religion and morality, and most potent to raise our country to an equal footing and elevation with the most civilized nations of the world—even with our blessed Mother Country—in all that is pure in virtue and sound in learning, advanced in civilization, and generous in patriotism.

I have the honor to be, Sir,
Your faithful servant,

TORONTO, April 6th, 1861. E. RYERSON.